CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canadä

NL 339 (r. 86/06)

0-315-19625-4

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

28

67533

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur: Peterat, Linda Bernice

Date of Birth — Date de naissance: October 21, 1946

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance: Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe:
Box 1493
Spruce Grove
Alberta T0E 2C0

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse: Re-Searching the Teachers' Perspective of Curriculum: A Case Study of Piloting A Home Economics Curriculum

University — Université: Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée: PhD

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade: 1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse: Dr T. Aoki

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date: Oct 7/83

Signature: LBPeterat

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RE-SEARCHING THE TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE OF CURRICULUM: A CASE STUDY OF PILOTING A HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULUM

by

Ⓒ LINDA B. PETERAT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1983

MICR

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: LINDA BERNICE PETERAT

TITLE OF THESIS: RE-SEARCHING THE TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE OF CURRICULUM: A CASE STUDY OF PILOTING A HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULUM

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE WAS GRANTED: 1983

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Linda B. Peterat

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Box 1493, Spruce Grove
Alberta TOE 2CO

DATED: October 7 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Re-searching the Teachers' Perspective of Curriculum: A Case Study of Piloting a Home Economics Curriculum".

submitted by Linda Bernice Peterat

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Secondary Education.

Supervisor

Lefebvre

Nancy R. King

External Examiner

Date: October 17, 1983

ABSTRACT

The teachers' perspective of curriculum has been contrasted to the perspective of curriculum dominating in traditional theory and action modes in curriculum projects. Traditional curriculum theory has developed, based on the administrative interest in controlled change of school programs and has been characterized as technical and instrumental in orientation. On the other hand, the teachers' perspective of curriculum is described as curriculum-in-action, a lived orientation in the world, and as situational in character.

The purpose of this study was to explore the teachers' perspective of curriculum, defined for this study as the conceptual nexus of meaning grounded in daily action. A co-researching approach was developed, involving two teachers in a series of conversations during a five month period in which they were piloting a revised high school home economics curriculum. Their perspective of curriculum was explored through conversation about their involvement in the piloting project, their teaching careers, situations, ideals and experiences. The conversations were treated to a hermeneutical, sense-making process, interrogated in terms of theories in curriculum, psychology, sociology and philosophy, for their import in advancing and enriching curriculum understanding.

The teachers' perspective of curriculum was portrayed as both personal and situated. The personal dimension is grounded in the beliefs, values and ideals of the individual teacher. It is constituted by the dynamic relationship between teacher, students and subject matter, a relationship which alters and guides both

teachers and students, as it is altered and guided. Curriculum as relationship is a medium in which is sought transcendence, the constant struggle to know and become, which is transacted in the dialectic between self and other in relationship. Relationship in curriculum is further grounded in the teachers' knowing of herself as knower.

The personal dimension speaks as well of who we are as individuals beyond the school situation. How we see ourselves in relation to society and the possibilities we see for ourselves is the ground on which transcendence is sought. Curriculum is grounded in gender and class and our consciousness of the intersections of gender and class with all other levels of our being and knowing. This dimension connects to our professional belief system and the extent to which its ideology grounds the personal beliefs and ideals of teaching.

As situated, the teachers' perspective of curriculum is partially a reactive stance, formulated in a situation named by administrators. Curriculum as situated connects to factors within the school system itself, the relationship to other courses, school expectations and climate, and student expectations. Beyond the school situation, curriculum derives from the negotiated relationship between teacher and educational bureaucrats. Curriculum is thus a dynamic perspective which connects the personal dimension and its multifacted situational dimensions, all of which relate and change over time.

In this study, the connections between curriculum and gender emerged as central to understanding. Parallels are noted in the

relationships between females and society and teachers and curriculum. Curriculum is revealed as intricately bound to the personal consciousness of the teacher. Curriculum development therefore cannot proceed without opportunity for personal and professional development of teachers which encourages a claiming, both psychically and structurally of the grounds of curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to sincerely thank Dr. Ted Aoki for his encouragement, advice and assistance during the course of this study. I am, as well most grateful for the interest and assistance, at various stages throughout, from: Drs. Harry Garfinkle, Ken Jacknicke, Diane Kieren, Verna Lefebvre, and Max van Manen.

The support and encouragement of Angeline Martel and Terry Carson throughout this venture has been most meaningful. I am forever indebted to my co-researchers for their time, openness and interest. Throughout as well, has been the interest and patient endurance of Jurgen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

1. INTRODUCTION 1

    1.1 THE PROPOSAL FOR THE STUDY 1

    1.2 THE PROJECT AND THE PERSONAL 4

    1.3 TERMS OF REFERENCE 6

    1.4 FEATURES OF THE APPROACH 7

    1.5 SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS 16

    1.6 BENEFICIARIES OF THE STUDY 18

    1.7 OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION 19

2. SITUATING THE STUDY 21

    2.1 CURRICULUM CONCEPTUALIZATIONS 21

        2.1.1 The traditionalists, conceptual-empiricists and reconceptualists 24

        2.1.2 The empirical-analytic, situational-interpretative and critical orientations... 30

        2.1.3 Related reconceptual studies 35

    2.2 HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULUM........................ 39

    2.3 SUMMARY 55

3. PLANNING FOR A CURRICULUM PILOT PROJECT 58

    3.1 OBSERVATIONS OF THE PROJECT IN PLANNING 58

    3.2 CURRICULUM IN AN INSTRUMENTAL MODE 65

    3.3 SUMMARY 69

CHAPTER Page

4. THE TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE OF CURRICULUM 73
    4.1 BIOGRAPHY AND ASPIRATIONS 76
        4.1.1 Marilyn 77
        4.1.2 Donna 86
        4.1.3 Conversation and curriculum: A retrospect 97
    4.2 EXPERIENCING THE CURRICULUM PILOT PROJECT 118
        4.2.1 To question and say no 118
        4.2.2 Work for education people 130
        4.2.3 Conversation and curriculum: A further retrospect 142
    4.3 SUMMARY 149

5. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS 153
    5.1 SUMMARY 153
    5.2 IMPLICATIONS 166
    5.3 COMMENTARY FROM CO-RESEARCHERS 179
    5.4 THE PROJECT: HOPES AND REALIZATIONS 183

BIBLIOGRAPHY 192

APPENDIX 206

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PROPOSAL FOR THE STUDY

During 1981-82, home economics curriculum in Alberta at the senior high level was in a process of change. Part of that process was the piloting of a revised curriculum draft, developed by committees of teachers who had worked during the previous year to arrive at a re-structured and re-organized program outline. This study, situated in the piloting phase of a curriculum revision project, proposed to explore the teachers' perspective of curriculum, to understand this perspective and how it is shaped and influenced through participation in the curriculum project.

Recent writing in the area of curriculum theory challenges the dominant view of curriculum founded on the ideas of Franklin Bobbit (1918), Ralph Tyler (1950) and later, Hilda Taba (1962), a view which has prevailed during the past half century and is based on scientific management principles, concerned with stipulating goals, objectives, generalizations, and directives for action. Elliott Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance (1974) and later James Macdonald (1975) challenged this dominant mode of curriculum thinking by emphasizing and elaborating about alternate conceptualizations of curriculum. William Pinar (1975) extended the challenge through focusing his work on elaborating the subjective, personal biographical perspective of curriculum. Michael Apple (1979) further challenged the dominant mode of curriculum theorizing by pointing beyond the personal to the political interests underlying curriculum thought and action. These criticisms of the dominant conceptualization of curriculum opened possibilities for a deeper and renewed understanding of curriculum; an understanding concerned with curriculum as lived experience and as a mode of reproducing the structural, political and power relationships of society.

The past two decades have been a time of profound questioning of the dominant theoretical and research approaches used in the human sciences. Educational research traditionally borrowed its theoretical frameworks and research methodologies from the social sciences which in turn borrowed from the natural sciences. Within sociology, Alvin Gouldner (1970) challenged social theorists to look inward to understand their own theorizing activities and to understand that their theorizing and research activities affect and alter the world they study and live in. In the curriculum field, Joseph Schwab (1972) argued that researchers must cease their search for global, theoretic explanations and concern themselves with specific problems. He denounced the unquestioning use of social theories and emphasized that appropriate educational research must focus on the practical. Other criticisms of research approaches in education have been advanced by Elliott Eisner (1979 & 1981) who differentiated between the scientific and artistic modes of research and by Thomas Barone (1978) who conducted his thesis study of classroom experience in a qualitative and wholistic approach. Numerous recent educational studies provide examples of research conducted in a descriptive, qualitative mode (Elbaz, 1980; Willis, 1977; Scheinfeld & Messerschmidt, 1979).

The criticism of traditional educational research approaches emphasizes that the choice of approach carries with it certain assumptions, pre-suppositions which will determine the questions and the findings which will result. Traditional research approaches involving hypothesis testing are criticized for reducing, objectifying, and distorting the lived realities of the people or situation under study. Beyond the explicit purposes of the inquiry, critics assert that implicitly the traditional approaches are conservative, serving to maintain and perpetuate the status quo in social arrangements and asserting a technical-rational logic as the scientific mode for understanding human experience.

Martin Lawn and Len Barton (1981) claim that with few exceptions curriculum studies have been unable to connect with "the day-to-day events, thoughts, actions and struggles of teachers" and to relate these in an historical, political and structural analysis. A wholistic portrayal of the teachers' reality would focus on the dynamic process of mediating contradictory expectations at the ideological and practical level. An adequate approach would focus on "the historical, structural and contextual factors involved, as well as the interpretations and strategies that teachers use to cope" (1981, p. 13).

Entering the curriculum discourse at a time in which alternate perspectives of curriculum are being advanced and traditional research modes are being challenged, this study proposes to focus on the teachers' perspective of curriculum in home economics with the purpose of understanding in a broad sense the teachers' reality as they consider what and how to teach each day. It is thus an attempt to theorize about curriculum in an alternate mode, a mode which views curriculum in the teachers' perspective, as lived reality. It recognizes the possibility of alternate views of curriculum and is thus situated within a curriculum piloting project, a situation in which alternate views confront, engage and realize each other. The research approach in the study is formed with profound regard for the humanness of the participants and project. It is an attempt to structure a study which is wholistic and moral in recognizing and portraying the fundamental qualities of human struggle and dynamics.

1.2 THE PROJECT AND THE PERSONAL

The focus of this study formed from my experience as a teacher in secondary schools and as a student of curriculum. As a teacher, curriculum was a document outlining the course of studies which one was expected to follow. It was often ignored or forgotten as I went about my teaching and occasionally was referred to in the search for ideas for teaching or ways of relating concepts, generalizations or objectives which the curriculum outlined. Among colleagues, the curriculum was often a focus of criticism and complaint. If only it would be changed, up-dated, revised, our programs would be better. Curriculum held the possibility, the hope for better programs.

As a student of curriculum, I saw other possibilities in curriculum. Curriculum was much broader than the document with which I generally associated it. Curriculum was all the experiences of the student in school. There was hidden or implicit curriculum, as well as explicit. There was the teachers' experience as well as the students' experience of curriculum. Curriculum served political and social interests which were diverse in a pluralistic society. I was aware of a tremendous gap between the theorizing I encountered in curriculum literature and what I understood to be the continuing practice of curriculum development at the school system and government levels. The beginning questions formed: What was the meaning of this theorizing to future work I might do in curriculum development as a curriculum worker or as a teacher? Why did our thought and action persist in terms of curriculum 'implementation', 'development', and 'piloting' when there seemed to be ample evidence of the limitations of this approach to curriculum?

My experiences as both a teacher and a student, and the questions which arose from those experiences formed in terms of the relationship between theory and practice. As a teacher, my world and experience was defined in terms of practice. I was front line, I did things with students, I acted, I practised. As a student, I entered the world of theory, a world viewed commonly by teachers as superfluous, irrelevant, out of touch, theoretical. My experience told me however, that as a teacher, I also thought, questioned and wanted to know why and how and when and what in a very deep sense. As a student, I rejected much of the curriculum literature that viewed the teacher as deficient and as object. Thus, within and from these experiences, the question became one of the relationship between theory and practice. Must our approach to this question be dichotomizing and thus self-denying or is a relationship possible which is both unifying and authenticating?

Thus, the core theme of this study is the relationship between theory and practice, what we mean by these terms and their relationship within curriculum. It is to this core theme that considerations throughout the study return. It is in the interplay between theory encountered in curriculum literature and its philosophical base, and practice encountered in the teacher experience and participation in the curriculum project and reflectively in my own experience that understanding is sought.

1.3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

This research proposed a study of perspective. Perspective derives from the Latin "perspicere", meaning "to see through, to look at closely". Perspective is defined as the "appearance, relationship, or relative importance of events from a specific point of view" (MacMillan Contemporary Dictionary, 1979, p. 752). The re-searching of perspectives in this study refers to the looking closely at points of view on curriculum. The points of view are those found in current curriculum literature, in discussion with the two teachers of this study and in the events and process of the curriculum piloting project. The interest in this study is not in taking a particular perspective and testing its fit to the situation but rather in attempting to understand the situation through various perspectives, the relationship between perspectives and through questioning my beginning perspective in the re-searching activity.

'Re-searching' is meant to convey the re-study of curriculum perspectives, the desire to go beyond the exploration of ideas for idea's sake to the exploration of ideas in the concrete situation, in this case, the ideas of teachers during a curriculum piloting project. The re-searching is the activity of the study, the thinking and re-thinking of ideas which are altered, extended and shaped through the observation at meetings of teachers and consultants, and through discussions with the teachers and principals involved.

Curriculum is a fleeting and conceptually intricate notion, defying final definition. It has been defined as "the relationship between the knower and the known" (Pinar, 1980, p. 73), and as "the situation that we must claim and make our own before we can act" (Grumet, 1978, p. 306). As the focus of this study, curriculum will be explored as the conceptual nexus of meaning of the participants of the study. Curriculum is re-searched as the perspective of teachers in the educational situation, a perspective on curriculum-in-action. Curriculum is a pervasive notion in that it touches all aspects of life and experience as a teacher and as the focus of this study, it provides a frame for the continual asking: What is curriculum? What influences such views?

1.4 FEATURES OF THE APPROACH

This section outlines the dominant features of the proposed inquiry approach. The final chapter of this dissertation contains a reflection on the approach as it developed and was experienced during the study.

In determining the research approach appropriate for this study, I was drawn to Alvin Gouldner's (1970) criticism of the dominant research approaches in the social sciences and his reminder that our theorizing and research activities affect and alter the world we study and live in. In other words, the research approach selected contains a certain view of those we study and our relationship to them. We can either objectify and distance ourselves from the researched and thus also be distanced and objectified or we can choose a subject-to-subject, interactive mode of research, attempting to reduce the distance between researched and researcher. A realization of this ethical element in research, claiming that our research ultimately results in our understanding of ourselves and others, stimulated a sensitivity to the experience of the researched.

Following Gouldner's criticism and attempting to provide an alternate approach to social research, John O'Neill (1974) developed the idea of 'wild sociology', an approach which would bring together the researched and researcher. Wild sociology,

> Rejects the rudeness of method that lacks any respect for the community that suffers its practices. It imposes upon its actions and speech the obligation to bring our lives together.
>
> (O'Neill, 1974, p. 51)

The approach of 'wild sociology' attempts to capture the human qualities of aspiration and dynamics rather than attempting to explain in theoretical terms a temporal and spatial segment of life or situation. It counters the tendency of traditional sociological approaches to reify the status quo.

> The concern of wild sociology is not just the encouragement of order in others but the very shape of our own life.
>
> (O'Neill, 1974, p. 82)

> It is found in a dialogue that is entirely rooted in the aspirations of human development and political community.
>
> (O'Neill, 1974, p. 79)

I was at the same time drawn to the work of Thomas Cottle who devotes his research efforts to writing sociological accounts about aspects of people's private lives. He views his research activity itself as a form of caring. "Lives are recorded because there is inherent value in preserving human experience" (1977, p. 13). He expresses his concern with the ethical dimension of his work and the specific policy decisions based on research findings. Some members of our society are in the position to formulate policy and direct programs which both affect the lives of other society members either directly or indirectly.

> So it comes to pass that some of us have earned the right to speak for other people and to claim that we know what it is they want. But speaking for someone else is at best a compromise and a convenience, if not an outright presumption, no matter how legitimate a political act may be. Because isolation breeds dogmatism and righteousness, the best way to know that one's notions, theories, and suppositions are right may be to take them to the people about whom they were originally conceived.
> (Cottle, 1977, p. 14)

We are reminded that our research findings, resulting from the specific approaches employed, affect us all through policy decisions and through the understandings the research 'stories' provide about us, individually and collectively.

Finally, to be congruent with current curriculum theorizing, the research approach in this study needed to provide the possibility for personal and communal development as well as for critical reflection on both self and society. From these considerations, the re-search approach was structured and proposed as an ideal, starting plan.

The central ideal was that of a co-researching relationship between myself and the two teachers who would participate. As an ideal, the idea of a co-researching relationship was a goal, a relationship which would be attempted. The co-researching relationship seemed a possible goal, for I believed the focus of this study was a genuine concern and problem for both myself and the teachers. The teachers were both involved in piloting the curriculum revisions and curriculum would be for them a very real, daily concern. I was interested in understanding the teachers' experience and the curriculum piloting project better in order to see ways that such projects might be organized differently and better for those involved. In addition to the focus of mutual concern, the co-researching relationship assumed that my involvement in the piloting project through this study could influence and shape events or experiences in the curriculum project and in turn this study would be shaped and influenced through events and directions in the curriculum piloting project. In this sense the approach was intended to be flexible, able to be modified depending on the unfolding of the project to which it was connected.

The co-researching relationship assumed as well a particular mode of understanding or interpreting. In the larger sense of this study, the focus and approach are already an interpretation, that is, the questions asked and the way in which these questions are pursued constitute a particular form of interpretation or 'seeing' (Palmer, 1969). Had I chosen to explore the question of curriculum perspective through a survey approach on a large sample, the approach would have been pre-structured. From the literature, other surveys and pilot testing, I would have derived a list of possible variables which would form a check-list type survey on which teachers could indicate their thoughts and feelings. Through scoring and computing the responses I could have arrived at an opinion network descriptive of the teachers' perspective. However, I chose rather to enter the study as a real person, interacting with two teachers, indepth and over time. I wanted to capture and attempt to understand their lived experience of curriculum and through dialogue come to understand more of them, myself and the focus of our work, curriculum. The co-researching relationship offered the promise of a creative, human developmental and personally liberating approach. By striving for this type of relationship, a more wholistic, relational and perhaps contradictory understanding or interpretation would be the result. Such an interpretation was desirable for its naturalistic stance and the potential it held for portraying the lived reality on which a teacher's everyday actions in the classroom are based.

A second desirable aspect of the co-researching approach was the mutual questioning of each other permitted through the intensive dialogue, a questioning which could probe not only the present but also the meanings contextualized by past and future temporal frameworks. The ideas of each person in the relationship could be played against the other, interact and bring each other to form or expression in dialogue and reflection, and final reflections on the research study as an experience. The co-researching relationship could permit a mutual questioning of participants and interpretation in the sense of meaning or coherence of an experience or action for a person. Consistent with the co-researching spirit of the study, the writing of this dissertation was checked by the participating teachers to assure agreement on the meanings it portrays and the teachers were asked for final comment and reaction on their participation in the study.

Three specific approaches were proposed as part of the co-researching ideal: interviewing, observation and journal writing. Observation began early in 1981 as I attended two meetings of the Home Economics Curriculum Coordinating Committee to observe the discussion about plans for the piloting project. For purposes of observation, I also attended the series of four meetings organized by Alberta Education for the piloting teachers. These meetings began in August, 1981 and extended to February, 1982. These meetings were attended so that as much as possible, I could experience the meetings as a piloting teacher. This shared experience provided a focus and a context for understanding the teachers' comments and experiences. The observational approach used is best described as 'observant participation', a term coined by Thomas Cottle (1977) to emphasize observation rather than participation. It is recognized that one's presence in a situation may affect the situation but the main interest of the researcher is in observation. No overt participation in discussion or events was made and hopefully the participation effect was minimized.

It was also proposed that observation in the teachers' classrooms may be appropriate for enriching the depth of understanding. However, as the study progressed, the need to limit the amount of data plus the desire to establish a trusting and non-evaluative relationship with the teachers were influencing factors in the decision not to conduct classroom observations.

I proposed to use journal writing as a means for developing self-awareness and for reflecting on events and involvement in the study. Michael Littleford (1981) emphasized that self-reflection should be included in our research approaches. Self-reflection, he claimed, is the other side of social action.

> Social actions without self-reflections are blind and irresponsible; self-reflections without corresponding and congruent social actions are meaningless and alienating.
>
> (Littleford, 1981, p. 211)

I was familiar with and had used the approach to journal writing proposed by Ira Progoff (1975 & 1980). Simply, Progoff's approach is to structure a journal with various sections for engaging in different writing activities. Various sections are intended for daily log entries using re-reading, reflection and re-active writing, writing on one's past, present and future, recognizing steppingstone events in one's life, and dialoguing with events, people, one's body and work. The approach emphasizes attention to inner movement, feeling and imaging, and attempting to bring these to words. Underlying the entire journal approach is the idea that to write about thoughts, feelings or events is to concretize or capture the experience and thus to be able to move forward or beyond that experience. In writing is reflection and in re-reading over time is another reflective activity which permits a freedom in and direction of one's life, gained through the increased self-awareness.

William Pinar's (1975) autobiographical method for reconceptualizing curriculum in a subjective perspective (currere) is a process similar to that advocated by Progoff. Focussing on one's own educational experience and through a process that is regressive-progressive-analytic-synthetic, one develops the knowledge of self-as-knower which is the essence of currere. Pinar proposes that awareness of one's self in the present is made possible through recognizing and recalling the past, the regressive phase. In the progressive stage, one projects one's self through imaging into the future. In the analytical stage one juxtaposes the past (regressive writings) with the future (progressive writings) to know the present. One analyzes to derive the present, through questioning how the future is present in the past, the past in the future and the present in both. In the synthesis stage, one questions the knowledge of the previous stages to explore the meanings of the present as a base for action and direction. Autobiography is a means of securing the roots of our theorizing, by recovering our intentionalities. The reflective method is a critical process in that through reconstructing the relation of the knower to known in one's own educational experience, one can reclaim the possibilities of one's own experience for guiding future action and direction.

Journal writing served two main purposes in this study, as a deliberate and focused effort of reflection on events and ideas related to the study and as a means of tracking my shifting and evolving thoughts and feelings during the study. Journal writing was also proposed as possibly appropriate for the participating teachers in the study. However, since journal writing can be an arduous, time consuming task and neither of the teachers were currently writing in journals of their own, it was considered inessential to the purposes of this study. Journal writing could serve as the central data source in a study such as this rather than as an addition to interview data.

Interviewing was the prime means for seeking the teachers' perspective of curriculum. A series of five interviews with approximately a one month separation between each interview was conducted with each of the two participating teachers during the time period from September, 1981 to February, 1982. One interview was also conducted with the principal of each of the teacher's schools.

On interviewing, Raymond Gorden states "Experience ...shows that no single approach, style or technique of interviewing is adequate except within narrow limits" (1975, p. 50). I came to the task of interviewing with experience and understanding of the Rogerian approach to interviewing (Rogers, 1961) as well as William Glasser's approach as outlined in Reality Therapy (1965). The ideal I proposed for this study is the hermeneutical interview (Smith, 1980). Such an interview is not strictly structured by the interviewer's selecting of questions and searching for answers from the interviewee, but rather attempts to be a dialogue. While the interviewer still has a purpose in mind, the interview becomes a means of jointly seeking through dialogue that which is relevant. "A question is a creative act which seeks to bring to unconcealment that which is hidden" (Smith, 1980, p. 62). Thus the interview is a means through which we search for shared meanings, for that which we may talk about. For the interviewer, this means a sensitivity to what is said as well as what is unsaid. It requires a sensitivity in the moment of dialogue, and in reflection, a sensitivity to lead the unsaid to articulation.

Raymond Gorden (1975) claims that the ability to empathize and to engage in sympathetic introspection is important in the interview situation. Such an ability to empathize depends on the extent to which a person has experienced the same situation or is able to imaginatively construct the situation of the other. It also depends on the sensitivity to and remembrance of one's own experiences.

From the literature on feminist research, Ann Oakley points out the possible contradiction in terms when we think of women *inter*viewing women. She reminds us rather of the potential for genuine dialogue based on similarity which women interviewing women offers.

> It becomes clear that, in most cases, the goal of finding out about people through interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship.
>
> (Oakley, 1981, p. 41)

In this study, the interviews with the teachers and reflections on the interviews were occasions for empathizing and introspection as I attempted to recapture my own past experiences and situation as a teacher. The hermeneutic form of interview was considered appropriate for its possibility of developing a genuine subject-to-subject dialogue consistent with the co-researching approach.

1.5 SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Twenty-seven high school home economics teachers from locations throughout Alberta were chosen to participate in the piloting project, a part of the department of education's curriculum revision plan. From the twenty-seven piloting teachers chosen, two were invited to participate in this study. Two teachers would provide two different perspectives and thus a richer study, through the contrasts and similarities of their perspectives. As well, beginning a study with two teachers could provide a form of insurance if for some reason one person had to or chose to discontinue the project at some future time while the study was in progress. The teachers invited to participate in this study were selected because although we had never discussed curriculum or even professional matters in any depth, they were teachers I felt I would be able to communicate with in an easy and meaningful manner. They were teachers whose experience and ideas interested me. They were selected secondarily for reasons of geographical proximity and because each was piloting different home economics courses at the high school level. Their situations were contrastable, for while geographically close to each other, one school was a large urban high school and the other a rural high school.

Early in September 1981, the two teachers were contacted by phone and invited to participate in this study. The nature and purpose of the study was explained to them, as well as the approximate time commitment it would involve. The eager willingness to participate and the interest which both teachers showed in the study was both surprising and encouraging. All interviews with the teachers were conducted in their schools, at a time convenient to them. This usually meant that we met during blocks of preparation time in the teacher's schedule, usually conversing during sixty to eighty minutes. All discussions with the teachers were audio-taped, transcribed, and the typed transcription was mailed to the teacher prior to the next meeting time. From reflections on the dialogue in the form of the written transcription, questions arose for further discussion. Sharing the transcriptions with the teachers permitted a similar opportunity for me and the teachers to reflect on the dialogue and to guide future discussions.

1.6 BENEFICIARIES OF THE STUDY

This research approach was designed partially in consideration of its potential benefit to the participating teachers. Through their involvement in the curriculum piloting project, it was assumed that curriculum questioning would be of immediate interest and concern to them and that the opportunity to discuss and reflect upon their experiences could be helpful. It was also believed that this dissertation could be of interest to teachers in that as a description of others' experiences and thoughts, it may offer a form of dialogue on experience.

By attempting to provide a wholistic account of experience, it is anticipated that this study may also be of interest to curriculum workers who plan, organize and work with teachers in a curriculum development project. That through the account of the teachers' experiences and thoughts in this study, curriculum workers may have a broader understanding from which to direct policy and action in curriculum.

It is also anticipated that the study may contribute to reformulating our understanding of curriculum in a broader context. It may enrich and expand our curriculum theorizing and our actions with teachers in teacher education programs.

1.7 OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

This introductory chapter was intended to provide an overview of the concerns in both curriculum theory and research approaches which are the bases for the structure and questions of this study. The focus on the teachers' perspective of curriculum arises from both experience with and ideas in curriculum. The re-search approach which addresses this focus is an attempt at a genuine co-researching relationship, an exploration in linking theory and practice in curriculum.

Chapter 2 situates this study in terms of the current discourse about curriculum. A history and analysis of alternate curriculum conceptualizations are included. The study is further situated in terms of the history and development of home economics curriculum in general and specifically in the Alberta context.

Chapter 3 situates the study of the teachers' perspectives concretely in terms of the home economics curriculum piloting project in Alberta which provided the context for this study. This chapter includes observations of the planning leading up to the curriculum piloting project. It provides an elaboration of the curriculum perspective which dominates in this situation and provides the context of the teachers' perspective, elaborated in the following chapter.

Chapter 4 reports the teachers' perspectives as expressed in the interviews and as further elaborated through an analytic process which flows from personal reflections as a teacher (in the past) and researcher (in the present) and from searching current literature for an enriched understanding of the perspectives. The interpretation portrays curriculum in terms of class and gender considerations.

Chapter 5 summarizes the previous two chapters and advances a critical examination of curriculum. The possibility of progress beyond our traditional concept of curriculum and the relationship between issues in feminism and curriculum are considered. A consideration is included of the implications for home economics curriculum and curriculum praxis. The chapter concludes with a section on hopes and realizations, a final reflection on this project, and the final comments and reflections from my co-researchers.

CHAPTER 2

SITUATING THE STUDY

This chapter provides an overview of the current discourse in the curriculum field. It includes a consideration of the alternate ways of conceptualizing curriculum and situates the study within the reconceptual mode of curriculum theorizing. The final section of the chapter provides an historical summary of home economics curriculum, with consideration given to the social and political influences which shaped the field.

2.1 CURRICULUM CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

In recent decades, analyses of the curriculum field have focused on the alternate meanings or conceptualizations of curriculum. Elliot Eisner and Elizabeth Vallance (1974) drew attention to the conflicting conceptions of curriculum by outlining five different conceptions drawn from curriculum literature of the time. They believed that curriculum designers, administrators and the general public could order their discussions on and designs of curriculum by being aware of the different values and beliefs about education which were the bases of the various orientations to curriculum.

Eisner and Vallance proposed five alternate concepts varying according to the major goal or purpose of education. The five conceptualizations were of curriculum as: the development of cognitive processes, technology, consummatory experience, social reconstruction- relevance, and academic rationalism. The major belief behind the first conceptualization was that the prime purpose of schools and curriculum was in the development of cognitive skills which would assumably transfer to a variety of situations beyond schooling itself. The second approach to curriculum, as technology, was concerned with making education a smooth and efficient process of organizing, packaging and presenting knowledge. Those who believed that the major purpose of curriculum was to provide a consummatory experience for the individual concerned themselves with focusing on the student and the development of an autonomous, integrated and liberated individual. Curriculum dialogue in the social reconstruction-relevance conceptualization, emphasized the interest and needs of the society rather than those of the individual and saw the need for an evolving and renewing society. Curriculum as academic rationalism placed the major value on promoting the great ideas and accomplishments of human history and an emphasis on traditional academic subjects. Eisner and Vallance's schema was effective in drawing attention to conflicting conceptualizations of curriculum based on different values and belief stances. Their schema, however, was formed with the intent of ordering and clarifying these values and beliefs so that the planning of curriculum goals and contents could proceed more effectively. They did not question the possibility or form of curriculum discourse. Their analysis of the curriculum field did not include a reflective or self-critical examination of the idea of curriculum itself.

James Macdonald (1975) drew on the theory of knowledge developed by Jurgen Habermas (1971) in Knowledge and Human Interests, as a way of considering the values and beliefs which were at the base of curriculum thinking. The process through which curriculum was developed or enacted, revealed the value orientation. Macdonald proposed that the three prominent models for curriculum development could be related to the human cognitive interests suggested by Habermas, and distinguished the three curriculum development models as: the linear-expert model, the circular consensus and the dialogical model. The linear expert model was described as having a basic interest in control, initiated by experts who make the initial and final decisions about the validity of the content and process. The circular consensus model was exemplified by curriculum development efforts in which teachers and community are involved and in which consensus and communication are more important than control. The dialogical model involved the student in curricular development, emphasizing dialogue and self-reflection on cultural and personal connections. Macdonald thus applied Habermas' theory to understand alternate approaches to curriculum development and to enhance understanding of curriculum in general. He concluded that all curriculum designing and development is "a form of political and social philosophizing and theorizing". "It is an attempt to facilitate someone else's idea of the good life by creating social processes and structuring an environment for learning" (Macdonald, 1975, p. 293).

The conceptual schemes of Eisner and Vallance and James Macdonald are examples of efforts to order curriculum thinking almost a decade ago. The decade intervening has witnessed a burgeoning of curriculum questions and discourse on dimensions only tentatively projected. Two more recent approaches to ordering curriculum theorizing will be considered in detail in order to portray the richness of the dialogue and to illustrate the bases of this study.

2.1.1 The traditionalists, conceptual-empiricists and reconceptualists

Henry Giroux, Anthony Penna and William Pinar (1981) in an introductory, summary text of the curriculum field, distinguish three conceptual frames through which the major contributors to the field have developed their ideas. The three conceptual frameworks they identify are: the traditional, conceptual-empirical, and re-conceptual. Each framework is distinguished according to what is considered problematic, that is, the questions which each asks as well as does not ask and also according to the assumptions which each framework holds about knowledge and values.

Curriculum theorists generally locate the beginning of the curriculum field in the second decade of this century, as a focus of concern and interest for administrators, interested in improving the existing school programs. The beginnings were marked by Franklin Bobbit's book of 1918, The Curriculum, a book which applied scientific management principles to the design and development of curriculum. Bobbit led the group of curriculum thinkers which are described today as the traditionalists. The traditionalists' interest in curriculum was borne not from a body of knowledge or philosophy but from an urgent action requirement of an administrative position (Pinar & Grumet, 1981).

Michael Apple situates the traditionalists' interest in the social, historical moment of its origin and relates it to an interest shared by industrialists and politicians in social and cultural homogeneity and consensus. The schools were seen as the main socializing force with a prime role to play in enculturating the large immigrant populations to the American way of life. The traditionalists' interest is based on the great faith and hope which was placed on science and technology as providing the 'ultimately right principles' for the good life, a faith very strong at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. The curriculum field adopted the language of science and technology because it provided a powerful way of talking about educational events and policy, an explanation of educational occurrences and the "promise of better control, giving educators a greater ease of prediction and manipulation" (Apple, 1978, p. 99).

A later traditionalist, Ralph Tyler (1950) identified the fundamental questions about curriculum and instruction as:

> 1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
>
> 2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
>
> 3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
>
> 4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

From Tyler's conceptualization of curriculum developed the sequential planning activities of diagnosing needs, forming objectives, selecting and organizing content and learning experiences and planning evaluation, activities which framed the central questions of curriculum. This linear conceptualization of curriculum activity separated ends from means. Ends or objectives, on which it was assumedly possible to agree, were determined first, separated from consideration of activities and content. This conceptualization was a hierarchical plan in that curriculum planners were responsible for and controlled the process, usually working with teachers but ultimately retaining final decision over the developed plan. Thus, the plan separated curriculum doer, the teacher, from the curriculum planner who made decisions on what teachers should do. In turn, the process also separated teacher from student in that the curriculum plan was a pre-determined directive for teaching which could eliminate learning as deriving from the situational or interactive relationship of the teacher with the student. This form of curriculum planning sought efficiency, effectiveness, organization and control over teaching. Curriculum planning in this way assumed that uniformity in teaching was desirable and obtainable. In this conceptualization, knowledge assumed the form of facts or ideas which can be transmitted to students (or teachers). The ideas of theory and practice are distinct in this conceptualization of curriculum. Theory is that which is planned as prescription for action. It is removed from practice, embodied in the curriculum 'thinker' (consultant or specialist) and opposed to the teacher as practitioner.

In summary, the traditionalists conceptual frame for understanding curriculum was formed from the pressure for administrative action. It was fostered by the social, political interests in homogeneity and harmony of the populace and by the scientific promise of objective and absolute knowledge. The questions asked were reductionist and narrow, framed on the assumptions that consensus was possible on questions of educational purpose and process. The appeal and endurance of the traditionalists' conceptualization comes from the hope for solution offered, the action made possible, appeals which are very strong until we consider the questions which remain unasked.

The second approach in conceptualizing curriculum is that of the conceptual-empiricists (Giroux, Pinar & Penna, 1981). Within this framework is an allegiance to a model of logic and inquiry based on the physical sciences. The conceptual-empiricists interest is in certainty, control and prediction. This interest formed in an effort to improve on those curriculum aspects the traditionalists took for granted - the structure of particular subject areas or disciplines. The conceptual empiricists were promoted by the social and political interests from the 1950's onward. A renewed interest and faith in science, inspired by the Russians' surpassing of American science and technology in first launching an earth satellite in the 1950's, resulted in an effort to bolster American science through school programs. Subject area specialists and scientists became the directors of curriculum thought, focussing on the articulating of a disciplines' structure and knowledge forming processes. The conceptual empiricists were interested in conceptually distinguishing subject areas as the bases for school curriculum and for distinguishing the area of curriculum theory itself.

The third conceptualization of curriculum distinguished by Giroux, Penna, and Pinar (1981) is the reconceptual. The reconceptual framework represents a common interest of those who reject the positivistic and conservative orientations of both the conceptual empiricists and traditionalists. However, it does not represent an integrated or distinct school of thought. Within the reconceptual framework is an attempt to bring the human subject into the prime focus of concern. William Pinar's (1975) work as well as his later work with Madeleine Grumet (1976) in developing the idea of currere represents a focus on the person (teacher) as subject. Based in phenomenology and existentialism, currere is focused on the lived subjective world of the educator, 'currere' being the personal, interpretative approach to understanding curriculum. Currere encourages an understanding of the present being and activities as an educator by examining one's past educational experiences and by writing one's past memories in a journal format. By reflecting on one's past, one articulates one's educational ground which permits an interpretation of past in relation to present, part in relation to whole, so that a conscious and meaningful figure or dynamic emerges. Currere asks "What does this mean to you?" and uses autobiography to provide a response through articulation and thus interpretation. One's life is a text which provides meaning for present action. This subjective approach emphasizes the essential and determining nature of the actor in the action, of the teacher-in-the-curriculum. It points to the influences of one's experiences and reflections on future action. Curriculum becomes "the relationship between the knower and the known" (Pinar, 1980, p. 73).

Other reconceptualists such as Michael Apple (1981a & b, 1979, 1975) and Henry Giroux (1981) have focused on a critical analysis of the school as an agent of reproduction in a class differentiated society. Based on neo-Marxism and a socialist vision, Apple's analysis has pushed beyond the subjective-interpretative to consider the limiting factors in a situation. Curriculum is understood in terms of the limiting situational factors, historical, social, economic and political, which influence human consciousness and action. To search for understanding in the fullest possible sense means, "To pass from the psychological to the social, and from the social to the political-economic and then dialectically 'back' to the individual" (Apple, 1978, p. 519). Each of these situational factors do not exert a separate and independent influence but interpenetrate and relate at various levels.

Early curriculum writing in the critical or Marxist mode focused its analysis on the hidden curriculum or the covert intents and teachings of the educational process (Apple, 1971). It proposed that the school, largely through the hidden curriculum acted as a means of reproducing the social and economic relations of a society. It was argued that the school experience did little to overcome or alter the social inequalities based on class, gender or race, but rather, largely served to perpetuate these. Such an analysis was a direct functional analysis which assumed a passive individual who was processed through the educational system, affected not only by overt but also covert intentions in much the same technical, functional manner that was simultaneously being criticized through the analysis. The more recent writings of Michael Apple (1981) have come to criticize the determinism of this early analysis and to expand the concept of education as not only a means of reproduction but also of production of social relationships. This expanded analysis postulates the individual as an active negotiator and constructor within a frame of economic and social relations which are inherently contradictory. An adequate understanding of the experience of curriculum requires not a direct functional analysis but rather an analysis focused on contradictions, conflicts, mediations and resistances as well as reproduction. The ideology which schools reproduce is not a form of false consciousness directly based on economic relations but is rather a part of the lived culture, a result of the material conditions of daily life and action.

The reconceptualists, whether grounded in phenomenology and existentialism or in neo-Marxism and critical theory share a common interest in bringing about the unity of theory and practice in an emancipatory or liberational interest of freeing individuals and groups from exploitation and oppression. The reconceptualists describe themselves as being a field in progress, developed as a critical exercise "studying signs of educational practice to discover what might have been, what still may be" (Pinar & Grumet, 1981, p. 38).

2.1.2 The empirical-analytic, situational-interpretative and critical orientations.

Ted Aoki (1979), based on Jurgen Habermas (1971), differentiated three orientations of curriculum inquiry, each according to the underlying perspective or view of the relationship of people to their world. The view of people in relationship to their world is expressed in the nature of the theory/practice relationship. The three orientations distinguished by Aoki were: empirical-analytic, situational-interpretative, and critical.

The technical conceptualization of our empirical-analytical orientation to curriculum postulates thinking and doing (theory and practice) as two separate activities. This dichotomous view relates to Aristotle's distinguishing of three modes of activity in relation to one's world: the theoretical, the practical and the poetic. In Aristotle's schema, the activity of the theoretical was visioning or theorizing, the type of knowledge exemplified in science and the end sought was happiness, the highest and most intense goal. The activity of the practical was ethical action, the type of knowledge was through deliberation and the end sought was the righteous life. In the poetic sphere, the activity was production, the type of knowledge was ability, dexterity or skill and the end sought was material comfort and accomplishment (Rotenstreich, 1977). For Aristotle, theory was the purest and preferred mode for it did not interfere with but only contemplated the process of things, whereas the poetic and practical modes did interfere. This distinction made by Aristotle lies behind the conceptualization of theory and practice in the technical mode. In the technical orientation to curriculum is the idea that theory is developed by someone else, usually academics or researchers, and then can be applied to a particular problem or situation. Theorizing is thus the activity of the intellectual or someone in authority, resulting in theories to be applied or used by practitioners. Theories can be used to generalize, predict and control. This separation of theory and practice supported the belief in an objective science. The theoretical mode of activity was pure and objective in that it did not interfere in the world. This postulated the possibility of separating the knower from the known, the emotive from the intellectual.

Underlying the empirical-analytic orientation to curriculum are the main interests in efficiency, certainty, predictability, an intellectual and technical control of the world. The empirical-analytic orientation in Aoki's conceptual schema encompasses the interest of the traditional and conceptual empirical curriculum thinkers of the schema proposed by Giroux, Penna, and Pinar.

Within the situational-interpretative orientation proposed by Aoki, the relationship of people to their world is conceptualized in a frame which unites theory and practice (thought and action) within the human subject. Within the phenomenological concept of intentionality is the idea that consciousness is always consciousness of something. Therefore, thinking is always thinking in relation to some object. Intentionality denies a distinction between subject and object, theory and practice, thought and action. The individual actively contributes to and structures one's own meaning and experience. This idea challenged the natural scientific view of the individual as distanced from and objective in relation to the world, by proposing the concept of the life-world, a synthesis of the subjective and objective dimensions, the lived perspective on the world. The lived perspective thus assumes an intentioned existence. The individual is an active, integrating and structuring individual in a way that gives meaning to existence. In a phenomenological sense, theory and practice are not separate activities but theorizing is the source of knowing which encompasses and intertwines both thought and action. This sense of theory and practice holds different meaning for how we do re-search, how we come to know. Knowing is a 'meaning giving' activity; understanding is in terms of meanings people give to situations (Aoki, 1979).

The work of Pinar and Grumet (1976, 1981) in reconceptualizing curriculum as currere is based on a unified view of theory and practice. It is within the real life educational situations that we encounter both theory and practice. The intent of theorizing is not to resolve the differences between theory and practice nor to reduce one to the other, but to recognize theory and practice as two dimensions of a whole. It is in playing one against the other that we come to know, it is in the tension and the relationship between each that we come to know the limitations and possibilities of ourselves and our situations.

> Just as what we think and know about our work is contradicted daily by the events in which we participate, the actual experience of teaching and the certainties that activity offers may be undermined by the questions and alternatives that theory cultivates.
>
> (Pinar and Grumet, 1981, p. 38)

The critical orientation to curriculum, based in neo-Marxist and critical theory is critical of the technical, instrumental orientation for its neglect of hidden or implicit values within human action and institutions. It criticizes the situational-interpretative for its liberal, idealistic values, for over-emphasis on internal mental processes as the determinants of human action and for ignoring the limiting influences of societal structures and institutions on human consciousness and action.

The idea of theory and practice in the Marxist sense is contained in the idea of praxis. For Kosik (1976), the real world is the world of human praxis, where things, meanings and relations are products of social beings. Human beings create themselves through their own works in history. Vazquez (1977) points out that theory and practice are abstractions from a unity which cannot be explained in simplistic mechanical terms. The relationship is one of interdependency, interaction and adaptation which develops historically. The idea of praxis reminds us that our thinking and theorizing shapes our world by naming it and guiding our actions while at the same time our theorizing is influenced by our experience and practical actions.

For Paulo Freire, praxis is liberation, "The action and reflection of men(sic) upon their world in order to transform it" (1970, p. 66). As such, praxis is the source of knowledge and creation. People's activity in the world is both theory and practice, it cannot be reduced to either.

The critical orientation to curriculum is exemplified by the work of Michael Apple and Henry Giroux who focus on analyses of ideology, control and hegemony in educational situations. Their work as critical is inspired by a sense of a social, moral consciousness and an interest in emancipation.

Aoki's orientations to curriculum inquiry differentiate between the ideas which Giroux, Penna and Pinar classify as the reconceptualists. Adapting from Habermas (1971), Aoki distinguishes between the reconceptualist work grounded on the subjective-interpretative philosophy of hermeneutics, phenomenology and existentialism and that grounded in critical and neo-Marxist theory.

The classificatory schemes of Aoki and Giroux, Penna and Pinar provide two different approaches to ordering curriculum understanding. Giroux, Penna and Pinar have ordered the various approaches to curriculum, distinguishing according to the different questions asked and unasked in each of the categories. Aoki has ordered curriculum inquiry, differing according to the underlying views of the relationship between people and their world. This study of the teachers' perspective of curriculum in home economics is an attempt to enter the curriculum dialogue in a reconceptualist orientation. As such it is interested in focusing on the teacher as subject, and on the teachers' lived experience. It permits a macro or wholistic perspective, through anticipating a broad scope and depth in its curricular focus. As a reconceptualist study, it is part of an inquiry approach which is not a unified school of thought but is an attempt at a creative, reflective inquiry, potentially transformative of that which it engages: the researchers and curriculum.

2.1.3 Related reconceptual studies

Several recent studies in the reconceptual orientation have a similar focus to this study and have served as examples in formulating the approach. Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt (1979) and Elbaz (1980) conducted field oriented studies within the situational-interpretative mode. Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt proposed that teachers have deeply rooted classroom ideals which are at the base of their classroom decisions. They engaged two teachers in a series of interviews involving reflective dialogue on classroom actions. Classroom ideals were defined as "the teachers' convictions regarding the desirable relationship between the child and the learning environment" (1979, p. 299). The study described the relationship between the teachers' classroom ideals and structural or organizational decisions which teachers made in daily teaching. Within the classroom, ideals was a dominant theme which Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt describe as a view of the ideal person-world relationship to the child. This ideal for the child was based on the teacher's own view of the world. The teachers' classroom ideals and world view constitute the interpretative framework with which teachers make decisions and decide what is personally meaningful in curriculum or educational change. Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt thus propose that improvements in teaching will come with efforts to help teachers articulate classroom ideals and to mobilize these ideals into classroom decisions. Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt's (1979) study is relevant to this study for the interpretative view it took and its approach emphasizing reflection and self-discovery for the participants.

Elbaz (1980) was concerned with the inadequacy of the existing conceptualization of the teacher in the curriculum field. She proposed a view of the teacher as holding and using 'practical knowledge' and explored this concept through a series of open-ended discussions with one teacher. The teacher's knowledge was described as being held in a practical, operative mode and structured in terms of practical rules, practical principles and images. The teacher's practical knowledge was summarized in the notion of 'cognitive style' which referred to the way the teacher used knowledge to shape practice. Cognitive style was described largely in terms of the teacher's images of curriculum, subject matter, instruction, social relationships and self. Elbaz descriptively portrayed the complexity of teachers' knowledge which she believed demands "A corresponding complexity in our conception of the curriculum process" (1980, p. 310).

Both of the studies by Scheinfeld and Messerschmidt and Elbaz describe the complex lived experience of teachers and provide insights into the interpretative activities of teachers. Both involved approaches which attempted a co-researching relationship with the participants in the research and both also placed emphasis on encouraging reflection by both the teachers and themselves as researchers on their work and the study. There is a tendency to ask of the utility of such studies - what can we conclude, learn, or recommend from such inquiries. However, such asking draws us to a utility or technical interest rather than the enriching sense of knowing, which is the interpretative interest. This sense of usefulness in the interpretative orientation is more aptly described as a resourcefulness.

> Theorizing contributes to one's resourcefulness...not in a simple means-end as applied, technical pragmatic sense, nor in an attitudinal or subjectivist psychological sense. Theorizing contributes to one's resourcefulness by directing the orienting questions toward the source itself; the source which gives life or spirit to (inspires) our pedagogic life.
>
> (van Manen, 1980, pp. 12-13)

Research related to curriculum in a critical orientation has been conducted by Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green (1975) who studied a progressive primary education program in England. They considered the teachers' perspectives in relation to the school, its environment and social relations. Within this critical perspective, the view of people is one of being

> More than merely a responder to certain fixed stimuli in the environment proceeding on some mechanistic and

> determinate destiny, but acting within a context which cannot be intended away by consciousness and which narrows the range of likely ensuing behaviour.
> (Sharp & Green, 1975, p. 30)

Gerald Grace (1978) studied teachers of urban working class students in an attempt to understand their structural location in society and the impact this had on their actions as educators. He combined an account of the historical origins of teachers and their [illegible]orical and contemporary relation to a particular form of ideological struggle, with an account (through interviews) of the teachers' own consciousness in relation to their work situation and their pupils. The socio-historical analysis suggested that there has been a significant change in the modality of control in urban education. Urban teachers experienced a limited form of autonomy in that control has moved from a visible, centralized form to an invisible and diffused form of control. Invisible control is constituted among other things by examination boards and their definition of valid knowledge, by constraints of the work situation, by what it means to be a 'good teacher' and 'being professional'. Being professional tended to inhibit consideration of relations between education and the socio-political structure and through controlling the time and opportunity for reflective questioning, a subtle mode of control maintained the teachers in a conservative stance. For the majority of teachers, there was little possibility for challenge or critical reflection on their activities.

Paul Willis (1977) studied working class boys in an all-male comprehensive secondary school in an industrial area of England. The study provides an example of a Marxist ethnography (Apple, 1980) in its illustrating how ideology and culture are produced rather than imposed within the school situation and how this production is achieved through struggle, conflict and contradiction. Willis portrayed how within the student sub-culture, students act in contradictory ways that both support the cultural and ideological reproductive process while at the same time partially penetrating or altering the conditions of their existence in society. For example, the working class male students he studied rejected the world of school. The official knowledge and hidden curriculum of the school had little meaning to the actual world of work which they came to know through their parents and their own experiences, and to the social life with their peers and within the neighborhood. By rejecting the school values of mental labour, they affirmed their own identity within the manual working class for whom school holds little value. On the one hand, the students were able to resist and partially penetrate the culturally reproductive role of the school. They were able to control and modify their life within the school system by modifying expectations, curriculum, etc., and in doing so develop skills which will be employed in the future work world to penetrate the reality of those working conditions. At the same time however, reproduced on the ideological level were the categories required to maintain work as it is.

2.2 HOME ECONOMICS CURRICULUM

In this study, curriculum is explored through the limited focus on home economics curriculum. The dialogue is with home economics teachers and it is through our talk about home economics curriculum that we speak about home economics and curriculum and the interrelations between these two ideas. This section sketches the history of curriculum in home economics education in order to situate the project and dialogue of this study.

The earliest beginnings of home economics education in North America have been dated to 1668, when early records show that monies were granted by the King of France to the Ursulines and Nuns of the Congregation of Quebec to purchase wool for knitting instruction for the young school girls of colonized New France (Bevier, 1924). Home economics has been a part of school programs as long as females have been educated and the view of education has been to prepare young people for their later adult roles. Consequently, home economics grew in popularity and came to prominence during the nineteenth century as part of the expanding educational opportunities for females which in turn was part of the first wave of feminism. Home economics was inspired by many of the same ideals which inspired the early feminists and embodied numerous conflicting and paradoxical ideas.

In the early nineteenth century, domestic science programs began in numerous school systems, as a form of education encouraged and thought appropriate for females. One of the early influences in home economics education was Catharine Beecher who in 1841 wrote A Treatise on Domestic Economy which contained information on foods, clothing, home management, personal relationships and home care of the sick. This book was followed by the Domestic Receipt Book in 1842 and these two books set out the form for teaching domestic economy which influenced school programs during the next forty years. Beecher encouraged women to take control of the household and to work for the betterment of the home and domestic sphere. She argued that women were morally superior to men, this moral superiority evident in their highly developed capacity for self-sacrifice. She believed that by teaching girls about domestic economy in the schools, they would be better prepared for their tasks in the home and because of their training, they would also achieve societal respect for their work.

During the 1870's and 1880's, there was a growing interest in manual training programs for boys at school. Domestic science for girls provided an ideal companion program to manual training. Thus began the enduring tradition of providing industrial or vocational education for males and home economics for girls. This led to home economics being considered as vocational and occupational training, an approach which remains, particularly in the United States today. In the same era, the land grant colleges were developing in the United States and they gave impetus to the area of home economics, but also again largely as a companion program to agriculture and mechanical arts programs for males. The land grant college programs as well as vocational training programs in schools were part of the effort toward universal education. Educational programs expanded to include vocational as well as classical educational programs. It was argued that many children of rural and working class parents needed appropriate, manual training suited to their futures in industrial labour. While the interest in vocational training for males at school and college level was meant to prepare them with skills marketable for wage labour, the domestic studies programs for girls prepared them for domestic labour, unpaid in their own families or at low wages for other families. Many parents only supported classes for girls which had no relation to paid employment and provided training for futures as homemakers.

One of the key figures behind the founding of home economics as a profession was Ellen Richards, a social feminist who believed in women's rights but wanted broad social reforms, reforms which would make the world more home-like (Hayden, 1981). Richards firmly believed that in scientific knowledge was the power for furthering the well being of humanity, through improving the environment. From both ecology and euthenics, Richards drew the central focus of home economics as the relationship between human beings and their environment.

At the fourth Lake Placid conference of 1902, a tentative definition of home economics emerged and came to guide the profession until recent years:

> Home economics, in its most comprehensive sense, is the study of the laws, conditions, principles and ideals which are concerned on the one hand with man's (sic) immediate physical environment and on the other with his nature as a social being and is the study especially of the relation between these two factors.
>
> (Craig, 1945, p. 15)

The beliefs formative of home economics are captured in the home economics creed in which Ellen Richards states that home economics stands for:

> The ideal home life for today unhampered by the traditions of the past.
>
> The utilization of all the resources of modern science to improve the home life.

> The freedom of the home from the dominance of things and their due subordination to ideals.
>
> The simplicity in material surroundings which will most free the spirit for the more important and permanent interests of the home and society.
> (quoted in Baldwin, 1949, p. 17)

The term domestic science or domestic economy was considered appropriate for school programs whereas the profession would be known as home economics. Economics was chosen in an attempt to retain the sense of the Greek word of origin 'oikonomia', which referred to household management. By the early 1900's however, the word economics had come to refer more to managing the affairs of business and nations rather than households. Thus in 1902, 'home' was added to economics to distinguish the focus of the field of study.

Marjorie East (1980) claims that home economics has developed according to four different models: economics, human ecology, inductive reasoning and homemaking. Within the economic model, the focus of home economics is on household management and decision making. The human ecology model focuses on the application of science for improving the quality of daily family life. The inductive reasoning model focuses on John Dewey's philosophy and beliefs about laboratory experience. Home economics is an inductive reasoning process which leads from sensory, manual experience with concrete objects, to recognition and discovery of basic principles about the objects and their use, to the development of general reasoning abilities. The fourth model emphasizes education of women for proper feminine, domestic/societal roles. All four models have influenced school curriculum with certain models dominating according to social, economic conditions or geographical location. All four models are situated within the dominant view of women in society. While the feminist movement of the nineteenth century fought for equal educational opportunities for women, this came to mean not the same education as males but rather education for future roles in society which for women were seen as firmly within the domestic sphere - a future as wife and mother. The domestic feminists such as Ellen Richards and Catharine Beecher believed that the status and recognition of women's work in the domestic role in society would be improved and enhanced through education for that role. Through the embodiment of the domestic principles and knowledge in a profession and the training of young women in the schools, the importance and skills essential to the domestic sphere would be realized by the larger society. Eleanor Vaines (1981a) analyzed the proceedings of the Lake Placid conferences, searching for present professional direction through what was said, by whom and how often at the founding conferences. She found evidence of a relatively liberated view of who was responsible for home tasks in that only 39.8% of the 289 contributions to the proceedings were addressing women only. However despite such a liberated view, other societal trends prevented this view from being realized in school programs in particular.

While domestic science supporters emphasized the 'science' aspect of home economics, the director of domestic science for New York schools, writing in the first issue of the Journal of Home Economics (Williams, 1909), stated that home economics most often won support from board members as a 'moral factor' in education. It seldom appealed on a scientific basis. One Board of Education commissioner for New York City is quoted:

> My own convictions are so strong that I would put it (home economics) as the culminating course in every woman's education. The effect of this branch of education would be the greatest force in overcoming idleness, thriftlessness and vice, that we could introduce into our curriculum.
>
> (quoted in Williams, 1909, p. 78)

It was further noted by Williams that the favourite definition of one director of domestic science programs was 'motherhood'. Thus the societal pressures on home economics were to support and encourage the view of women as the moral upholders of society, a projection of responsibility on to women at a particularly crucial time when the corrupt, harsh and competitive nature of the industrial-labour sphere was being constructed in opposition to the nurturing, compassionate and moral home sphere.

In Canada, Adelaide Hoodless is most associated with the introduction of domestic science into educational programs for girls. Her interest resulted directly from the death of her infant son from diarrhoeal disease and her later learning that had she had the knowledge of proper sanitary conditions, his death could have been prevented. It became Mrs. Hoodless' mission to see that other women would have such knowledge. Mrs. Hoodless sought support for domestic science programs through the National Council of Women who at their annual convention of 1893, passed a resolution stating:

> That the National Council of Women of Canada do all in its power to further the introduction of industrial (or manual) training for girls into the public school system of Canada, believing that such training will greatly conduce to the general welfare of Canadian homes and that copies of this resolution be sent to the ministers of education of each provincial government.
>
> (quoted in Rowles-Simpson, 1964, p. 11)

Introduction of domestic science courses into public schools was approved by the Department of Education of Ontario in 1897. A major triumph was the introduction of domestic science into the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph. Here, household science was introduced as a program for girls, paralleling the manual training program for boys. An ardent supporter of manual training, justified the programs accordingly:

> I am just as averse...to teaching cooking in schools as I am to teaching carpentry, except for the educational processes and their effect on the mind as well as the body.... From a course in sewing, properly graduated as an educational process, girls may derive quite as much mental advantage as boys obtain from a course in educational wood work. The qualities of precision, patience and industry come from it, and it further cultivates good taste, a love of the beautiful and also appropriateness in dress.
>
> (Robertson, quoted in Rowles-Simpson, 1964, p. 41)

Support for the domestic science programs came as well from the Young Women's Christian Association who had offered early educational programs, serving the young girl working in industry and trying to live independently on a low wage. While Adelaide Hoodless supported Ellen Richards' interest in applying scientific knowledge to problems of the home, there is little indication that Hoodless shared any of Richards' vision for social and domestic reform. Of home economics, Hoodless claimed, "It is women's work and must have women associated in its development" (quoted in Stamp, 1977, p. 21). Hoodless viewed the independence of women as a mixed blessing. The advantages of the new freedom had to be balanced against the potential disadvantages for home and family life, or as Work expressed it:

> While women have a right to enter independent wage earning occupations outside the home, we must consider the danger of making too broad the pathway leading from the home and

> of obscuring the chief practical department of womens' endeavour.
>
> (Work, 1909, p. 329)

With the professionalization of home economics in the early decades of this century, the original vision for major social reforms of Ellen Richards and Anne Dewey were nullified by conservative societal pressures. As home economists became professionalized, there was a need to distinguish their work from the untrained, unpaid labour of the other women working in cooperative ventures or community, domestic assistance programs. The home economists highlighted the advantages of 'scientific' child care, cooking and housekeeping. As new professionals, we could not risk being associated with unconventional experiments which were technically or financially questionable or with unconventional people who might show sympathy for socialism or challenge conventional sexual morality (Hayden, 1981).

At the turn of the century, society was on a decidedly conservative turn. With suffrage won, in Canada in 1919, feminist movements disappeared rapidly. New social forces dominated. The American Home Economics Association along with other moderate womens' organizations were accused of being anti-democratic and anti-American in the 'spider web incident', a part of the red scare of 1919-1920 in the United States (Hayden, 1981). Home economists such as Lillian Gilbreth and Christine Frederick were at the forefront of embracing an anti-feminist, pro-consumption ideology perpetrated through advertising in the burgeoning mass media and acclaimed as the greatest idea America had to offer (Frederick, 1929). Corporate advertising interests became a dominant force through gaining influence of the editorship of mass circulation magazines and radio. The vision promoted throughout the next several decades was one of suburban home ownership, complete with numerous appliances and cars, the male as the wage earner and home owner, and the female as the domestic and consumption manager.

Home economics curriculum in this time became a course almost exclusively for females. It embraced the model of 'home management' and consumer education also gained a central focus. While the two world wars lured women into male trades and occupations, the overall effect was to reinforce the idea of separate male and female spheres when at war end, women were dismissed from jobs and expected to exert their moral influence, stabilize the domestic and social sphere and engage in male-hero worship.

The home economics profession, despite claims of being a field for both males and females, has remained a female dominated field, shaped and influenced by its femaleness and the perpetuated societal stereotypes of the female role. Marjorie East (1980) believes that this 'femaleness' has been to a great degree responsible for many of the characteristics of home economics. She portrays today's home economist as womanly, family-centered, conservative, traditional and not ambitious or highly motivated toward power or positions of influence over others. They get along well with other women and men who prefer the traditional female. The female character of the profession and the social, political and economic influences which have shaped this female character are the context in which home economics school curriculum has formed.

From an awareness of and a concern about the continual gap between the ideals of home economics and the actual nature and impact of its professionals, recent critical discourse in the field proposes new directions. In 1979, the paper Home Economics: A Definition, commissioned by the American Home Economics Association and written by Marjorie Brown and Beatrice Paolucci was released. In the paper, Brown and Paolucci provide a philosophical analysis of the history of home economics and propose new directions and priorities for home economics. They cast home economics as a practical science concerned with the home and family and describe its purpose as:

> To enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead to maturing in individual self-formation and to enlightened, cooperative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals and means for accomplishing them.
> (Brown & Paolucci, 1979, p. 23)

In describing home economics as a practical science, they chose to unite the ideas of knowledge form and professional practice. Within the term 'practical science' is contained both meanings: "the practical nature of home economics and the body of knowledge and mode of inquiry as scientific in nature" (1979, p. 11), thus, they propose home economics as a "binding together of philosophy and empirical science".

Brown and Paolucci draw also on Jurgen Habermas' (1971) theory of knowledge in arguing that home economics must encompass all forms of knowing: analytic-empirical, cultural hermeneutic, and critical. They urge a greater concentration of inquiry within the cultural-hermeneutic sciences.

Marjorie Brown (1980) furthered this critical line of discourse in examining specifically the question of: what is home economics education? She criticized home economics programs in the schools for attempting to be too many things to too many people and called for a priorizing of issues and focusing on doing fewer things well. The conceptualization she outlines suggests changes for school programs.

> It would place more emphasis (1) on the family as a source of the improvability of persons as individuals and of the human condition generally and (2) on conditions in society which need to support the family in its efforts and, in contemporary society, which need to change in order to do so.
>
> (Brown, 1980, p. 131)

The consequent changes in school programs which this renewed conceptualization imply are:

> Less emphasis would be placed on the skills and crafts of homemaking as central to the good life in the family but it would not eliminate them.
>
> (Brown, 1980, p. 131)

> Home economics education would not be part of vocational or occupational training because the purposes, the processes and content of the two are categorically different.
>
> (Brown, 1980, p. 131)

Brown further proposed that home economics as a conglomerate of courses (personal living skills, food in the family, consumer education, home management, etc.) with "little or no integration among them and little or no depth in any of them" should be eliminated (Brown, 1980, p. 131). School programs should be of equal value to males and females, concentrated at the secondary and adult levels.

In Marjorie Brown's vision, the central focus of home economics curriculum would be a deliberation on the perennial practical problems of families, not in an effort to reach any definitive answers but in an exploratory, communicative effort to bring to discussion the central and enduring problems of families.

The ideas of Marjorie Brown and Beatrice Paolucci are beginning to influence school programs in Minnesota and Wisconsin (Brown, 1977; Henrie, Strom & Wilkosz, 1979), whereas there is little effect noted to date in Canadian school programs.

In Alberta, home economics programs have been in the schools since 1895. The first courses were in cooking and sewing and were variously titled domestic economy, housewifery and household science. In the early years and as late as 1961, the homemaking model predominated.

> The successful teacher in the field realizes that while she is concerned with developing in her students the abilities and skills pertaining to homemaking, her major responsibility is to instill in each girl a belief that homemaking will enrich her life and the lives of those around her, and to help her realize this goal.
>
> (Alberta Education, 1961, p. 1)

Home economics was first introduced at the upper elementary to grade nine level. It was considered as a 'finishing' training for girls' future role in life, later being expanded to high school as girls and all students began to stay in school longer. During the 1940's, the curriculum reflected briefly the part women played in industry. The clothing and textiles section, for example, contained a section on vocational needs (Mann, 1981).

Curriculum trends in Canada have largely followed trends in the United States. Early curriculum was designed based on the tasks required of students in their future domestic roles - food preparation, clothing, textiles and home design, family relationships, community contribution, and home nursing.

In the early 1960's, the United States Office of Education began a national project for curriculum development in home economics. The project was established to address two concerns: a re-examination of the definition and scope of home economics and a response to the curriculum reform movement influenced by the 1957 Russian launching of the first earth satellite marking the entrance into space exploration. The interest was part of the discipline centered curriculum movement which focused on articulating the subject matter content, through outlining the concepts and generalizations of the discipline. The United States project resulted in the publication _Concepts and Generalizations: Their place in high school home economics curriculum development_, which formed the basis for the curriculum revisions in Alberta in the late 1960's. The revision which began in the late 1960's materialized into a new curriculum guide in 1972. The home economics programs for both junior and senior high were structured into three study areas: modern living, food science, and clothing and textiles. The curriculum guide was detailed according to concepts, sub-concepts, generalizations, objectives, subject matter, suggested times and activities, suggested teaching aids and evaluation. The human relationships portion (modern living) received a new emphasis in being recommended for a one-third teaching time in junior high and as a separate course in senior high.

The curriculum was a composite, attempting to include all models of home economics. There was evidence of home economics as inductive reasoning:

> Much of the content may be found in the earlier guides but the approach has changed. The student, through active involvement with a problem, has a new experience, reacts, analyzes the clues and formulates a generalization.
>
> (Curriculum guide, p. C&T-3)

The family focus was emphasized:

> A changing society presses for changes in family living. In order to respond to or reject the involved pressures that result from change, individuals and families need courage and objectivity to view their relationships within identified value systems.
>
> (Curriculum guide, p. ML-3)

> The course is intended to be taught with full acceptance of the many differences in family composition and levels of living in home communities, in the nation and in the world.
>
> (Curriculum guide, p. ML-3)

The feminist movement of the twentieth century had an impact and the intent became one of education for both males and females.

> In the past, courses in this field were designed for girls. Today, the scope can be enlarged to include boys.
>
> (Curriculum guide, p. C&T-3)

Within a few years of introducing the revised curriculum in 1972, there was concern that the curriculum had not been adopted, that it was not being taught. In 1977, the Home Economics Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association, urging for a curriculum revision, passed a resolution requesting an evaluation of the current curriculum. While no evaluation was conducted, in 1979, approval was granted the Home Economics Curriculum Coordinating Committee to proceed with a re-structuring of the curriculum into a modular format. Each module was to be a conceptual unit constituting twenty-five hours of instructional time. Some modules were to be compulsory in a course while others were to be elective. The change was a response to the perceived need of teachers for more structure and detailed planning assistance.

During 1980, ad hoc committees worked on re-organizing each of the three senior high courses into modular form. The food science course was newly titled 'food studies' and modern living was changed to 'personal living skills'. Each clothing and textiles and food studies course consists of from one to three core compulsory modules and elective modules to constitute either a four or five credit (module) course. Personal living skills is to consist of a choice of at least one module from each of the living skills, family skills or applied skills areas with the other one or two modules selected from any of these three areas, food studies or clothing and textiles. While it is emphasized that the curriculum change is structural, the document from which teachers work is in a new format, newly written and organized according to generalizations, objectives, suggested learning activities, resources and content checklist. Module topics such as outdoor clothing/equipment construction, senior side of living, or community services for children and the concepts within these indicate an altered content emphasis.

The re-structured curriculum is an attempt to provide more specific guidelines and planning assistance for teachers. It is not structured according to one particular model of home economics but continues in the composite form of the 1972 revision. All models of home economics are included, signs of economics, human ecology, inductive reasoning and homemaking are in evidence, plus an emphasis on vocational planning.

2.3 SUMMARY

There are and have been parallels between the discourse in the curriculum field and home economics. Home economics entered our educational institutions as a field of study at a time when schools, in the interest of providing universal education, expanded programs beyond classical academic subjects to include vocational training and courses suited to special interests. Home economics gained prominence as a course for females. Curriculum in the traditional view was concerned with designing courses as a means to a particular end. The end to which courses would strive was to prepare students for their future roles in life. For girls, this meant preparing them for their future domestic/societal roles and thus, home economics content and focus was shaped, based on analysis of the tasks in this future role. Home economics, designed to meet the needs of females, has been influenced by the dominant ideology about women's role in society. It has been influenced by all the various views of women as upholder of societal moral and aesthetic standards, as loving, nurturing and self-sacrificing, as home manager, as consumption expert. Early curriculum addressed these various views and evidence of these influences presently remain.

Beginning in the 1950's, curriculum discourse altered in the interests of the conceptual empiricists, those who devoted their energies to conceptually structuring particular fields of knowledge. The American Home Economics Association responded with a report of a national project on Concepts and Generalizations which was an attempt to "utilize concepts both as a means of defining the structure of home economics and as a basis for effective teaching" (1967, p. 5). Home economics was defined according to five major concepts: human development and the family, home management and family economics, foods and nutrition, textiles and clothing, and housing. These five major concepts and the generalizations outlined for each were the basis for structuring home economics curriculum during the next several decades.

Recent curriculum discourse is described as reconceptual in interest. The reconceptual interest calls for the recognition of the human lived experience in curriculum, a focus on the knower in the knowing process. Also within the reconceptual interest is a critique of the dominant ideology and of the hegemonic process in knowledge formation. Within home economics, there are similar reconceptual moves to recast the field in a critical, emancipatory interest in the individual and family. The reconceptual interest comes from an awareness that the dominant societal ideology about women and the family has influenced the substance and direction of the field, limiting its autonomy in pursuit of a central purpose and ideals. Home economics is criticized for being reactive to societal pressures and trends rather than being an active, directive force in the life of families and society.

This study enters home economics curriculum discourse at a time of emerging reconceptual interest. From the phenomenological and critical theory bases, there is the promise of uniting theory and practice in a genuine emancipatory process. However, if reconceptual discourse remains only discourse, it falls short of fulfilling its promise in action. This study focuses on the teachers' perspective of curriculum. It assumes the unity of theory and practice in the lived world of the individual and questions the possibility of this unity on a societal level, in the concrete situation of a curriculum development project. It explores the idea of curriculum for the understanding it can provide for shaping genuine emancipatory action in the lives of teachers and students. It pursues two questions: What is curriculum in the teachers' perspective? What are the influences which shape this perspective?

CHAPTER 3

PLANNING FOR A CURRICULUM PILOT PROJECT

The purpose of this chapter is to portray the concrete context in which is situated the dialogue about curriculum in this study. It provides an introduction to the curriculum pilot project which serves as a backdrop to the teachers' perspective of curriculum. While not the central focus in this study, the pilot project is the context in which the problematic is explored. As researcher, I chose to enter the re-search not solely through interview with teachers, assuming that I understood the perspective of curriculum in the administrators' view. Rather, I chose to begin as openly as possible through observing at meetings at which the piloting project was planned, in an effort to question the orientation to curriculum evident in the planning discussion. This chapter, therefore, serves as an introduction to the main focus of this study on the teachers' perspective and is provided in an attempt to deepen and contextualize the later dialogue with the teachers.

3.1 OBSERVATIONS OF THE PROJECT IN PLANNING

The Home Economics Curriculum Coordinating Committee is the committee within Alberta Education which makes home economics curriculum decisions. The committee is composed of five teachers of home economics, a university representative and a supervisor of home economics, and is chaired by two provincial home economics consultants. The teacher representatives on the committee are selected from applicants recommended by the Alberta Teachers' Association and generally serve for two year terms. They are chosen based on consideration of factors such as whether they are teachers with the public or separate school systems, junior or senior high, rural or urban and according to region of the province. An effort is made to have a balanced representation based on these factors composing the curriculum coordinating committee. The supervisor of home economics who serves a term on the committee is selected on a rotational basis from among the supervisors of the major urban public and separate school systems of the province. The committee generally meets from two to five times annually, making decisions pertaining to curriculum and serving in assisting and advising the provincial home economics consultants who chair the committee.

In 1979, the Curriculum Coordinating Committee received permission from the Curriculum Policies Board to proceed with a restructuring of the curriculum into a modular format. During 1980, ad hoc committees formed in each of the three subject areas to work on restructuring the curriculum into a modular form. Each ad hoc committee consisted of members from the Curriculum Coordinating Committee and additional home economics teachers.

Planning for the piloting of this curriculum revision was primarily directed by the home economics consultants in Alberta Education and was discussed at two Curriculum Coordinating Committee meetings during the first half of 1981. I attended both of these meetings with the purpose of observing and listening to the discussion about plans for piloting, to understand the decisions and action which shaped the project.

The committee viewed the pilot project as part of a curriculum development phase. Piloting and curriculum development were seen in turn, as part of a larger ten year curriculum cycle. For home economics, this ten year cycle was subdivided into approximately one year for each of curriculum development, piloting and revision, optional implementation, and three to four years of implementation followed by one year for evaluation, re-assessment and revision.

Two meetings of the Home Economics Curriculum Coordinating Committee were attended during the first half of 1981, to observe the committee deliberations in planning for the piloting project to begin that fall. The observation of the committee meetings was done in order to have an understanding of the committee's responsibilities and structure. The observations provided an occasion in which to consider the view of curriculum from which the pilot project was being formed and to consider the influences behind this view. By listening to and considering the dialogue at the two planning meetings, a view of curriculum began to emerge in terms related to the purposes of the pilot project. Certain expressions and ideas recurred as the purpose and plan for the project were discussed and these recurring dialogical dimensions are described here as: 'piloting is not defined', 'a certain ownership', 'doing it our way', and 'using the information'.

'Piloting is not defined'. A proposal for the curriculum pilot project was developed by one of the home economics consultants. Since "piloting is not defined in the department", she considered the curriculum development procedures followed by other subject areas in similar projects and developed a proposal for the project. She consulted the literature and concluded that piloting means different things. For home economics, piloting would be seen as part of the curriculum development process, it was not implementation. The main purpose of piloting was to learn whether the module system worked or not. Her proposal was considered and an administrative decision was made based on the cost of funding the project. The proposal, although considerably reduced, was granted approval for a project involving twenty-seven teachers and costing approximately twenty-seven thousand dollars. The cost of the project would involve transportation, accommodation and meals for teachers attending meetings, cost of replacement teachers for their days absent and for books and materials.

The idea of piloting was described in committee discussion as an opportunity for a "test run". Checking on the recognized definition of the term 'pilot', is found: "one who directs another in his conduct or course of action", "to guide", or a "preliminary, trial or sample", the word deriving from the French "pilote", a steersman or the Greek "pidon", rudder (MacMillan, 1979, p. 762). Within the idea of a curriculum piloting project is the preliminary (leading up to the main action) test of the revised course of studies. Also within the root and meaning of piloting is a strong implication of directing, guiding, steering, conducting. Will the piloting guide the teacher in action or will the teacher guide the curriculum in development? The committee hoped that within the test run of piloting, certain modules could be tried and possibly deleted if they proved unsatisfactory. It was also hoped that through piloting, the teachers involved would develop a "certain ownership for the plan", because of the possible input they could have at the development phase.

'A certain ownership'. One committee member suggested that through piloting, "teachers on a broad scale can share in developing and thus feel a certain ownership for the plan". This certain ownership it was believed, would develop as teachers could have input into and modify the revised curriculum plan. An aspect of this developing ownership would be to make the students and teachers participating in piloting "feel special".

The members of the Curriculum Coordinating Committee felt a certain ownership for the curriculum revision. Members had worked on the ad hoc committees and approved the work of the committees. Thus ownership and commitment to the revised plan transferred to the Curriculum Coordinating Committee. The curriculum was a reality, a package, a plan. The problem of piloting was to transfer and expand this ownership to more teachers, thus assuring that the plan would be accepted and followed. The problem was one of dissemination, how to assure that the new idea would spread from the point of origin within the committee to gain widespread adoption among home economics teachers in the province. The solution to diffusion or dissemination was seen to lie in adequate "selling" of the revised curriculum. It was stated that "our selling of the curriculum (revision) has been successful", in that many teachers had volunteered to participate in piloting. Another committee member believed it was necessary to "sell the idea of piloting" by pointing out to teachers the professional recognition that would accrue as one of the selected piloting teachers. Such recognition it was hoped would result in ownership of or commitment to the revision by the teachers.

'Doing it our way'. The revised curriculum as a document for guiding teachers action was believed to represent a distinctly different "our way" of doing it. This also implied that the curriculum revision was in a sense a 'teacher proof' document, that following the revision, the teacher would adopt a new way of teaching much as she might choose to follow a new recipe or the route directions in a car rally, an unquestioning following toward a predetermined destination. If piloting were a test run, then the teachers were testing the revised curriculum or "run". To do a test run required teachers to do it "our way first". 'Our way', removes the teacher from the teaching and assumes that a way of acting is embodied within the curriculum document. Could we enter a classroom and after observation, declare that 'Yes, he or she is doing it our way'?

Within the expression of curriculum as 'our way' is also the separation of the developer (us) from the piloting or other teachers (them). Ownership of the curriculum resided with the Curriculum Coordinating Committee as developer. Such ownership separated the teacher representatives on the committee from the fellow teachers they were to represent and from their own selves as part of the 'they' of the other teachers.

This split between the developer of the curriculum and the 'doer' or teachers was described by one Alberta Education representative:

"Curriculum designers are architects, developing why's. Teachers are not concerned with why's; teachers work at the bottom line and go backwards. Teachers can follow". Beyond the split between the curriculum thinkers and doers, this statement points to the nature of the input expected from the teachers during the piloting project.

'Using the information'. The expected input into curriculum development from the teachers was in the form of information. "We must have a commitment to using the information learned in piloting in the final document". Such a statement implies that teachers will be expected to contribute to the development of the project through enhancing or embellishing the beginning plan, not that the contribution may be in questionning the major direction of the revision, that is, the modular format; not in questionning any of the assumptions or directions of specific aspects of the revision.

This idea of the teachers' contribution by way of embellishing rather than altering the plan was also indicated through comment during the discussion of whether teachers should be paid for participating in piloting. It was stated that "Teachers involved in the pilot are one step ahead of the game when the course comes into being". Such a statement suggests that the teachers' role in piloting will not be in altering in any significant way the revision, but that in fact the teachers will be privileged to lead in the adoption of the curriculum revision and that little change is anticipated as a result of the piloting phase. Teachers' willingness to test the plan will be rewarded in their being 'one step ahead', implying that revisions will be minimal as a result of the pilot project.

3.2 CURRICULUM IN AN INSTRUMENTAL MODE

While curriculum piloting was not defined by Alberta Education, it was a phase of most curriculum revision projects. From the discussions surrounding the planning of the curriculum pilot project, two major themes were evident. Piloting was a phase of development in which it was expected that teachers would contribute to directing and expanding or 'testing' the revision in practice, and at the same time piloting was a phase which would lead to diffusion or ownership of the revised plan. Such a dual expectation for piloting holds the potential for conflict of purpose since the scope of development which teachers may desire can lead to profound questioning of the revised plan, thus delaying adoption or acceptance of the plan.

The structure and organization of the pilot project provides an example of change based on a research, development and diffusion model (Havelock, 1971). The research, development and diffusion model considers the process of change from the point of view of the originator of the innovation or idea. It begins with the formulation of a problem based on presumed receiver need, in this case, teacher need. The initiative in determining this need is taken by the developer, not the receiver of the innovation. The phases of the research, development and dissemination model begin with identification of a problem, activities of finding or producing a solution to the problem and the final phase is that of diffusion or dissemination of the solution to the target group. The initiative in these activities is taken by the developers or researchers and the receiver is considered essentially passive as the adopter. Within this particular model of curriculum change, the pilot project is inserted between the development and dissemination phases, attempting to achieve dual purposes of dissemination and development.

The research, development and dissemination model of curriculum change is based on studies of planned social change and the ideas elaborated by Everett Rogers (1962). Rogers was concerned with how new ideas and practices spread from their point of origin to gain widespread adoption. His concern in diffusion was with the marketing of specific products or the diffusion of ideas in particular agricultural practices. In applying a similar process to a curriculum change project, the curriculum is commodified as a product and the question becomes one of how to "sell" the product. The research, development and diffusion model of change, borrowed from industrial management, commodifies curriculum much as the latest breakfast cereal or new car model. It represents a linear, logical model of conceptualizing change and an instrumental mode of thought and action.

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) later noted the inappropriateness of the research, development and dissemination model to educational change and pointed out that one of the distinctive aspects of educational diffusion is that it occurs in bureaucratic structures. Such structures with their bureaucratically organized communication channels may act to impede communication (MacDonald & Walker, 1976).

Bureaucracy represents the institutionalization of instrumental thinking, science applied to the organization of individuals so that the purpose of the bureaucracy will be carried out as precisely and efficiently as possible (Kliebard, 1975). Curriculum development as an administrators' activity in the educational bureaucracy thus assumes a dominant interest in precision, efficiency, and 'getting results'. Hummel (1977) points out that bureaucracy contains within itself the great paradox of being established to serve the public while actually serving to dehumanize the people it serves through a reductionary process. In order for bureaucracy to have results, to work, it necessarily must reduce the humanity of those who expect to be served by it. If the bureaucracy had to deal with the whole person in all their complexities and needs, it could not function in the efficient manner it values. Thus, while serving one need, for example, providing funds for the necessities of living, it diminishes the self-esteem of people, creating a relationship of dependency. Or in the case of education, while meeting the need for consultative services for teachers, it can create a relation of dependency, limiting creativity and individual initiative. Bureaucracy functions because it limits its scope of operation to one or a few needs of people and focuses on 'making the change'. A new curriculum document is the mode of action of the bureaucratic functionary. A curriculum revision or change can not (may not) cope with a broader task - questioning its own action or thought. A broadened scope opens a multiplicity of factors which interfere with getting results in the task.

Bureaucratic culture is free of concerns with values. Whether action is good or bad from the viewpoint of the client or subordinate functionary is not an issue. Standards against which conduct is judged is not concerned with means but with ends. Thus curriculum activities focus on elaborating concepts, generalizations, objectives and activities. Getting results is reduced to the small scope of materializing a new document, not permitting a broader questioning of results beyond the self-perceived function of the bureaucracy. Results such as better programs or better teaching is beyond the scope of the bureaucratic functionaries' responsibility. In the curriculum process, the curriculum leadership of the bureaucratic functionary is lost beneath the main pressures of the bureaucracy to function and survive. Thus curriculum projects in the bureaucratic setting are focused on selling ideas, getting results, meeting timelines.

> Stimulus-response, input-output, producer-consumer are all the same concepts, only expressed in different terms...people are manipulated as they deserve, that is, as overgrown Skinner rats.
> (Ludwig von Bertalanffy in Kliebard, 1975, p. 67)

The research, development and dissemination model of curriculum change implies certain assumptions. It assumes that teachers are technicians, another level in a bureaucracy where knowledge can be dispensed like the latest bureaucratic edict, without regard for the personal interaction between teachers and students nor the contingencies of diverse educational settings and interests. Secondly it assumes by its bureaucratic directive, some centralized expertise not available to the average teacher (Becher & McClure, 1978). Finally, it assumes value consensus about education and the nature of a particular subject matter on a level that does not exist. Within the instrumental orientation to curriculum, the major questions are expressed in terms of creating change in others:

development of the object (curriculum), implementation, in-service, piloting. Within this orientation is implied a particular perspective on curriculum. Curriculum as idea is reduced, objectified, commodified, 'thing'-ified. Curriculum becomes a means of domination, of directing other's thought and action.

3.3 SUMMARY

While piloting was not defined by Alberta Education, there was seemingly an opportunity to design a program which could be dynamic and different, re-shaping curriculum development of which it was a part. However, there was little encouragement for risk taking in the bureaucratic structure concerned with getting results such as having proposals and results of projects before various other committees at certain times for approval. While piloting was not defined, it was not necessary for it was determined by its embeddedness in the administrative research, development and dissemination model of curriculum revision which was already underway and was a model beyond question in the administrative view. At the first meeting it seemed that innovation would be possible. Timelines were not emphasized, piloting could take a year or more, good curriculum of lasting value was important. There was concern with the information and contribution teachers could make during the piloting stage. The emphasis was on development rather than dissemination.

The second meeting of the Curriculum Coordinating Committee was in May, 1981. By this time the pressures of time were evident. Piloting would occur in the first semester of the 1981-82 school year so that the results could be presented to the Program Approval Committee the following spring and implementation could occur in September, 1982. Piloting was being defined by the bureaucratic pressures of time lines and financial support for the project. Secondly, the need for the functionaries within the bureaucracy to achieve 'results', to make things work and 'on time' was more urgently felt. The revised curriculum, a new document, existed and therefore the questions shifted to how to have it accepted, used, how to sell it to the teachers. The interest in the contribution which piloting teachers could make to the development became limited to expanding or enhancing the plan as outlined thus far. Teachers could contribute by adding suggested learning activities, resource materials, or alter objectives or concepts. Development was clearly interpreted linearly, what can be contributed to enhance or expand the existing plan, not development by way of profound questioning which may revert considerations back to earlier phases of the research, development and dissemination sequence. Piloting was seen primarily as a test of teachers rather than a test of plan. 'Can teachers work with this?' was the question and the solution was partially seen in the need to "re-educate teachers" to make them accepting of and open to change.

The observations of the Curriculum Coordinating Committee were undertaken to gain an understanding of the view of curriculum apparent in their deliberations. The observations were entered into in an attitude of doubt, that is, a certain naive questioning of whether a technical-bureaucratic view of curriculum would be evident.

Because of the bureaucratic structure within which curriculum is directed in such a project, and the technical mode of thinking embodied in a bureaucracy, curriculum is thereby limited to a non-reflective, technical, instrumental mode. Teachers and curriculum workers within this structure become co-opted into the positions of bureaucratic functionaries.

Curriculum and curriculum questions asked within this mode are necessarily reductive and ameliorative and represent a range of questions which dominate curriculum literature: How to design, implement and in-service curriculum. To structure and pursue questions within this single orientation (paradigm) is to leave unquestioned the assumptions on which it is based and to perpetuate the instrumental mode of curriculum, a mode which advances elements of domination and dehumanization.

The structure and deliberations of the Home Economics Curriculum Coordinating Committee provided the context in which the piloting project was formed and conducted and thus the context for the focusing question of this study on the teachers' perspective of curriculum in home economics. While we recognize an alternate teachers' perspective on curriculum, what do we really know about the dimensions and dynamics of this perspective? This study turns to this question in a search for understanding of the lived, experiential perspective on curriculum.

It is not the main purpose of this study to elaborate on the instrumental mode of curriculum in its full nature or constitutionality, but rather to inquire into this mode only as an introduction. It is within the instrumental mode of thought that 'curriculum' was named and it is through this mode of thought that we can enter and question the idea of curriculum in the teachers' perspective. The extent to which dimensions of the instrumental orientation may be left unexplored or overlooked is a limitation of this study.

CHAPTER 4

THE TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE OF CURRICULUM

> Culture, social structure, language and personality may constitute the form of education, but its essence is found in the single life, in a single human being speaking about himself or herself, about history, circumstances, knowledge and a sense of possibility.
> (Cottle, 1973, p. 5)

> In his (sic) language, in his moral values and juridical forms, the individual - the isolated being - is even then and always beyond his particularity.
> (Gadamer, 1979, p. 122)

This chapter turns to the central focus of this study, the teachers' perspective of curriculum in home economics. This teachers' perspective is explored on two dimensions: in terms of the teachers' intents and action, and in relation to the concrete situation, the bureaucratic context which defines and acts on curriculum in an alternate interest. The dialogue with the teachers which is the substance of this chapter is centered on exploring these two dimensions of curriculum, in relationship to the teachers' experience in the curriculum pilot project and in relation to the teachers' autiobiography and aspirations, both personal and professional.

Curriculum in this chapter turns to the personal, lived perspective. It is what Madeleine Grumet describes as the "situation we must claim to make our own before we can act to realize its latent possibilities" (1978, p. 306). It is the idea of currere, not object but process, and expression of one's self, entailing both thought and action. James Macdonald (1982) describes this lived perspective as poetic, involving insights and images, a reflection upon self in a personalized and biographical manner.

This chapter attempts to capture the teachers' perspective of curriculum and portray it in a hermeneutic form. The dialogue with the teachers is the occasion to recall the experiences, emotions and ideas of my own teaching, to bring together my experience with that of the teachers, in a sense of re-living. This dialogue and re-living is the ground in which I question and attempt to make sense of the theoretical, the ideas within curriculum theory, psychology, sociology and philosophy, in order to reach for an enriched understanding of both the living of and reflecting on curriculum.

> Curriculum theory as a search for understanding, a meditative thinking, is an attempt to deal with unity rather than bits and parts additively. It is a theory experienced as a participatory phenomenon, where the person engages in dialogue with the theory, bringing each person's biography and value to the interpretation. The intention is not to explain (flatten out) for control purposes, but to re-interpret in order to provide greater grounding for understanding.
>
> (Macdonald, 1982, p. 56)

In the interpretative or sense-making activity of this chapter, the idea of a dialectic is an appropriate concept at various levels. Our thought processes are dialectic as we inquire and strive to know. Karel Kosik (1976) describes a dialectic as the process of getting at "things themselves" while Damir Mirkovic (1980) describes dialectical thought as an "heuristic device to aid man (sic) in his effort to penetrate below the surface of semblance" (1980, p. 58). Dialectical thought for both Kosik and Mirkovic is a process of going beyond the pseudo-concreteness or forms of surface reality. Such forms of pseudo-concreteness or pseudo-reality relate to the immediate utilitarian interests of daily action and shape the categories of common sense. Beyond the pseudo-concreteness is the essence or concreteness of reality which is gotten at through the dialectical process which destroys the fetishized creations or ideal or reified world. Heilbroner states, "dialectics is at the bottom an effort to systematize or to translate into the realm of manageable communicative thought, certain unconscious or preconscious modes of apprehending reality, especially social reality" (1980, p. 56).

The process is dialectic within the larger hermeneutic in which understanding is pursued through dialogue with the two teachers, interrogation of theory, questioning of ones self, and in each occasion of asking why, or saying possibly this or that, or no. The process is an interactive inquiry in which "theory and practice mutually modify each other, intertwine and produce a new emergent" (Mirkovic, 1980, p. xii).

The writing of this chapter strives to portray a hermeneutic process. When possible it captures the developing flow, originating with the teachers' talk, moving to my personal recollections, and interrogating the psychological, sociological and philosophical in a sense-making process. It is then drawn back to the central question of the teachers' perspective of curriculum and the influences on this perspective.

The dialogue with two teachers of home economics forms the basis of this chapter. The two teachers were interviewed each on five occasions at approximately one month intervals from October, 1981 to February, 1982. The conversations related to two aspects: the teachers' experience in the curriculum pilot project and their own meanings of curriculum. While each conversation evolved in a cumulative fashion from the preceding ones, a general sequence was followed. The first interview focused centrally on each teacher's past teaching experience and autiobiography, the second interview on reactions to experience thus far in the pilot project, discussion of my proposal for this study and ideals and beliefs in teaching. The third interview again focused on reactions to the pilot project and a discussion of how one uses a curriculum document. The final two interviews focused on further reaction to the meetings with the pilot project teachers and discussion on the relationship between personal life, career and curriculum and the impact of the curriculum revision on teaching ideals. A detailed summary of the discussion topics is provided in Appendix A.

4.1 BIOGRAPHY AND ASPIRATIONS

This section begins by relating sections of my conversations with both teachers, Marilyn and Donna. Segments of the actual conversations are included in order to portray as truly as possible the teachers' perspective through their own dialogue. The segments of the conversations included are those selected for the recurring themes which they substantiate and the essentialness they imply for understanding the individual teacher. Through our conversation, the themes which underlie and give form to curriculum show through: autiobiography, the ideals we hold for ourselves and our relationships with others and our situation, both institutional and societal. These themes we grasp and are grasped by our psychological and sociological theories and personal-political insights. In a further section of this chapter, the conversation segments are subjected to sense-making or interpretation in pursuing the question of curriculum perspective.

4.1.1 Marilyn.

Marilyn is a teacher in an urban public high school. She began teaching ten years ago and has spent her total teaching career within the same high school, interrupting it twice when children were added to her family and to return for one year of graduate study at the university. I first met Marilyn at the beginning of her career and we met on various occasions over the years at professional events and when she acted as a cooperating teacher.

Marilyn worked in a high school which had been planned and developed as a community school. She had done considerable curriculum development work in the high school modern living program and had gained public recognition for her work. She was one of the teachers asked to pilot the modern living 20 (personal living skills) revised curriculum during the autumn of 1981. Our conversations were limited primarily to a focus on modern living curriculum. Marilyn unhesitatingly agreed to participate in this study, stating that she was interested and as well, her school looked favourably upon involvement such as this.

We began our conversations one month after school began in the autumn of 1981 and met five times during the following five months. Certain themes re-emerged during our conversations. The themes are not discrete and isolated but overlap, intertwine and cumulate. They are at times explicit, at other times embedded beneath our talk about curriculum.

Love and efficiency.

Marilyn had studied home economics with a clothing and textiles major at university. Towards the end of her undergraduate years she felt herself more attracted to psychology and sociology and considered continuing graduate studies in social work at a university in another city. How did she come to be a teacher?

> Oh, quite fluky. It wasn't my field at all.
>
> I married and at the time my husband was going into dentistry and I thought, 'oh, yuk', I'm going to follow this man around the country trying to get clothing jobs. I mean, there were a dozen clothing jobs around the country, so I thought, well, I'll become a teacher. And yet I really think it's my field. I'm not an unsatisfied teacher and it's the right job for me. It's quite a perfect fit as far as meeting my needs in many things and also I can achieve more in this field than I could have in any thing to do with home economics, clothing.
>
> I have a very large, an enormous need to be loved and in my initial years as a teacher, I think that was first and foremost in everything I did.
>
> I needed to be the very best teacher they had ever had in their life. I needed that kind of feedback for those first five years actually. You know, until in my own mind I proved that I could do that and that was my most motivating force, I think for the whole first five years.

Over the ten years of teaching, Marilyn's needs as a teacher changed. She describes her first year of teaching:

> My older sister is a home economics teacher and started before me and I remember my first year as a teacher. Kathy told me what to do and I did it. You know, it was the best start I could ever have had because I needed to know what to say on day one and day two and day three. Then with a little growth, I could throw it all out the window.
>
> In my year four, I was bored because I am the sort that...I have to do it all. By that point I had gotten all

> my courses together, and even revisions throughout the years were easy for me to attack. I was tired of it all and I thought I needed something new. I wanted to do something more dramatic than what I had done.

The school in which Marilyn worked supported the ideas of community education and an experiential approach to learning. From the support and encouragement of colleagues and administration within the school, Marilyn developed a modern living 20 program containing experiential and community education elements. Marilyn received a teaching award and broad public recognition for her curriculum initiative. She received little support and encouragement however from other home economics educators.

> My entire source of support and strength came from the administration of this school who believed very much in community education and experiential education.

From this experience, Marilyn concluded that she was "just different than a lot".

> I find that often our field has been very narrow as to what I consider sound curriculum or even addressing sound curriculum. Like they get themselves into what I consider a very narrow vision and they think that this is the way a curriculum should go without allowing some perhaps very neat things to happen. And I think they also get very discouraged.... They expect things to move along in a certain way and then they don't appreciate teachers who don't go in that certain way.
>
> I see myself as being quite apart from what I consider the typical home economics teacher. I think most home economics teachers are not creative...I think they want to be handed clean packages. I think we are a clean, clean profession. We are not spinny, we're just straight. We are just straight. And I have some of that in me too, god, I am not knocking it.

Marilyn's personal needs and private life have altered during her teaching career, influencing her actions as a teacher.

> My career is very different in two stages: pre-children and post-children. And so now, I am no longer motivated by

> that (need to be loved). That is no longer my driving force. Now my driving force is efficiency. I can't think of anything else.
>
> I don't do anything outside of school time. When I am at school, it is school work and I do my school thing and when I leave this school, I don't want another thing to do with it. I don't want to come to meetings. I don't want to take work home. Like, they are very separate in my life now. And I don't want to be off on a weekend jaunt to do with one of my courses.
>
> I don't want to spend weekends away, I don't want to spend evenings doing things. Whereas before, I did a lot of that and really, really enjoyed it. Like that was you, that wasn't a hardship or a working overtime. That was part of what was going on. Now I don't want that because I have other people in my life that I find more important than this school or this curriculum and everything. Whereas there was a period in my life where this place was number one.
>
> I don't think that means that I am a lesser teacher. I have just resigned myself to the fact that for some period of my life now this place is not going to get the best part of me. Whereas for those first five years, they did get the best out of me. And they will again maybe in some other portion of my life.

Marilyn's life in the post-children stage contained other personal-career conflicts. Her husband was also a teacher but as she states:

> I think you can only take on one task in your life and do a good job of it in an overall sense. And I think if you are really excellent and into your career, you can not be very excellent and into your home.
>
> I am the ambitious teacher but I'm also the main giver in the family as far as we keep equal hours and he is as liberated as they come.... When I came back to teach, I believed that there would be an equal splitting. Well, that doesn't happen and it doesn't happen in hardly any marriage I see. I feel terribly typical in the whole career scene. Like we still look after the whole show at home and we can take on the career on the side.
>
> We're really a socialized animal. We almost seem totally incapable of breaking it and even when I know something is happening, I can't. Somebody can come over to my house and if my house is a mess, I feel responsible. Why should I

> feel responsible? But, I do. And we do this all to ourselves. It seems to me that if there is anything that I can't escape it's that whole role thing and even when I have it thought out in my head, it doesn't matter what rationally counts, it's how we end up working it day to day.
>
> The emotional part overrides everything for me. I deal with the world emotionally. A lot of males don't deal with the world emotionally. Like if I choose to stay at a meeting after school, it means that my kids don't see me. But if Ken chooses to stay at a meeting after school, it's no problem, because I'm going to be there anyway. It's sort of a different sense of freedom and the freedom is from the head.

The commitment and time conflicts which Marilyn experienced between her career and family have altered her actions and relationship with students and her personal career ambitions.

> I've ceased applying for central office positions because I cannot do them right now. I feel perfectly capable of doing them but given my other life, I don't.

Isn't love and efficiency almost two extremes?

> I think so but maybe not.
>
> I'm very efficient and I was efficient in those years too but...I was just as efficient in those years but I also had time for a great deal of other things whereas now these other things.... You know, if a student wanted to come in and talk to me for an hour, I delayed whatever. But I don't have that in me anymore, I don't want them to talk to me for an hour, which makes me lesser of a teacher because ultimately I think what we give as people is what counts. So they know how to put in a zipper if they don't already; but if you have given them something, to me that's where you make your mark as a teacher. I have always believed that and I will still always believe it. But at this point I know I'm not doing that.

Where special things happen.

Marilyn spoke of the ideals or visions she has of what learning and the good teacher-student relationship are. She brings to her teaching awareness of her own need for love and recognizes this as a universal need which underlies our educational actions.

> To be a really good teacher, to be a top notch teacher, is to be able to take love from those kids and I mean love, not just 'she's kind of a neat teacher', and to be able to give it back and say 'I think you're a really, really, really special human being and even though you are doing this and this wrong in a school sense, you are still a special being.'
>
> That's why parents are the most effective teachers. Because hopefully I will have that kind of influence on my children that I can give them a stroke and they will think that's neater than anything else and I can also dump shit on them and they will take it harder and yet at the same time knowing the whole while that we're still loving them. And that happens to some teachers some of the time. And I think that's when the special things happen.

Her understanding of what it is to be human and of the human need for love influenced particularly the approach she took in the modern living program she developed.

> I wanted to really touch some kids. Like we all teach them how to sew, how to cook, but I wanted to touch them as human beings and at that time there was also a lot of other courses in the school that were also striving to touch that person and I was very much into that. I wanted a course where they had to suffer a little as people, not as being frustrated because they didn't get that seam straight but where they would have to really question some things about themselves.
>
> It was based very strongly on a belief that I have of what education is - that we can learn most by experiencing things.

While holding to her ideals, Marilyn expressed the compromises she believed she had to and was making.

> I don't have the energy to love the whole thing around here, to be loved or to give love, because I'm doing something else in my life with that. But to be a really good teacher, that has to be an integral part of what it's all about.
>
> I remember in the old days when I did a lot of those sorts of things. I hoped everyone in this school had someone that they can interact with on that kind of deep level because I thought that was one of the very vital things

> that happen in a school. Unfortunately, right now I am one of those teachers who doesn't really carry their load as far as interacting at a very, very deep sense with some students and I can't do anything about that at the moment...but I think that's what teaching is all about.
>
> I firmly believe a teacher is a teacher, you don't change from out there to in here. And so you are but yourself and if that self is adequate or whatever, it's with its deficiencies and its positives, that is what you are in front of that classroom.

Marilyn's approach to conceptualizing her programs always returned to her prime value on experiential learning.

> Content, what is content?
>
> Let's first get to be good with each other as people and then we will talk about whatever.
>
> The main thing behind it is always experiential things.
>
> I decide on a general concept or topic.

The general concept or topic for Marilyn represented a vehicle, a focus such as child care or families through which to arrange experiential situations.

> I find it really difficult to label some of these things and do a unit on it when it happens anyway.
>
> It just scares me to pieces. The same thing with these personal living skills. I can do the transactional analysis and it will work, labelling it that, but by talking about a lot of things we do from day to day in that little course, we do an awful lot of dealing with 'how are you dealing with this little person?' and 'how are you dealing with so and so' and on and on. Like to me, you don't always have to piece meal it.
>
> I have them doing lots of theory and lots of reading and lots of listening but the crux of it is them working with some little kids and them seeing things and them pulling it all back together.
>
> I think the slant I started off using in those courses was a critical questioning of the world and no matter what you use, ask your students to critically analyze.
>
> I think critically questioning the world is really what we

> are all about. We can't do that all the time in everything or maybe we can't all do that anyway, I don't know...to a certain level I think we all can...different levels for different people maybe.
>
> Being responsible for one's actions and knowing how to analyze one's actions and to...like I lay alot onto them to do and I never check it out. I mean, I check up on it but I don't hound them. I don't...like my behaviour toward themalters very little depending on what they do. And yet the final mark is very dependent upon just exactly what they did throughout the year and those who are responsible and have learned that that's what it's all about, do quite well and those who are not capable of that kind of independent responsibility do very poorly. The same thing with any assignments that I give. I really don't mark them a lot on content. I mark them a lot on effort and what they seem to have gained almost personally from it as opposed to...I don't need them to know all the daycare laws in the province but if they have gone out and visited three to four day cares and kind of come back and...sometimes they have come back and they don't write it out but I hear because they are all excited about something or other - to me that is a really important kind of thing about what happens.

Marilyn's belief in experiential education conflicted in her broader considerations of how we organize our educational system.

> What on earth are we teaching all these subjects for to all these people? When you really look at education, the whole thing is silly. The whole thing doesn't work. I mean we don't all need to know the same tidbits of information at the same stages of our life and some of us need never know some of these tidbits of information and so if you dealt with it as here is this one human being, what do they need to know, of course you are going to get far more sound education than if 'these are the options you are going to take'.

Marilyn's ideals are repeatedly revealed as the core and essence of her being as a teacher. They are her guiding light, her inspiration, her vision. They are also her source of identity and source of frustration as she seeks to realize and pursue her vision in a limited and limiting situation.

A climate no longer the same.

Marilyn spoke of the influences which shaped her teaching at the earlier stages of her career and the influences which were now impacting on her actions.

> From the onset I decided that I wasn't going to worry about trying to figure out what they learned because sometimes I think that we are totally futile in doing that anyway and I didn't have some magic content that I was keen that they showed me that they had mastered. Because I wasn't sure what there was that I thought specifically they should master in that sense but I was very keen on the fact that they should question a lot of things...

Marilyn was reshaping the modern living 20 program this year, responding to changes from several segments.

> Its really been changed because of this curriculum. But it was due for a change anyway. I think it had outgrown...the climate of the school is no longer the same. The kinds of commitments I want to make to education are no longer the same.
>
> I was part of...there was five or six courses like that, that were all very much striving for the same kinds of things and we had an administration that was just really, really keen and the whole community school concept really peaked in my fourth, fifth and sixth year of teaching. Plus I was without children so I committed a great deal of my time and energies to teaching.
>
> I got into experiential education and community education because it happened to be that I was involved in that kind of a group and I really liked what was being said.

Marilyn described the changes in the school climate she was experiencing.

> Much, much more traditional - having very structured expectations in the sense of attendance being crucial, evaluation being very objective as opposed to subjective.
>
> It's just not very much stressing the person as a whole anymore. Very much fragmented into teaching subject areas and teaching specific things in subject areas, being able to grade those very accurately and specifically.

Some of that is positive and some is negative to my way of thinking.

I have changed some things. I am taking attendance and I have never taken attendance before. I am giving grades throughout the year which I have never done before.

I think I am making it a lot more traditional and a lot easier. Straight stuff is easy stuff.

I think for me to say 'do this report, give me these headings and have it in then' is easy stuff. When I say to them 'you phone such and such a person and see if you can have a visit with them and then in a few months I expect you to develop a relationship', I think that's hard. That's really hard and that's the difference in what's really happening, in my course and generally in the school, too.

I think it's the difference in what we think our kids should do. It's the whole school kind of thing, educational kind of thing. We stand up in front of them and talk at them and they write. That is a piece of cake for them. Whereas; if we don't say much and don't do much and they have to do it, that is not easy.

What's easiest for you as a teacher?

Straight structured teaching. It's the easiest for sure. Same reason, I don't have to give of me. I just sort of line them up and tell them they have to give this report and I don't have to suffer. I don't have to question myself. I don't have to cry a little or laugh a little. It's like I don't have to give of my own emotional self hardly at all. Whereas the other way, because I demanded that of them in their course, it was demanded of me too. But on the other hand, it takes more out of you but it gives you more back too. I still have kids who I will probably be involved with for a lifetime from those years, whereas I don't think I necessarily will from these years.

4.1.2 Donna.

Donna is a teacher in a large composite high school which serves students from a number of small towns in a rural county school division. This was the third school in which she had taught during her ten year teaching career and she had been in this school since it had opened. I had first met Donna at professional activities a couple of years earlier and had casually conversed at length with her during the first teachers' meeting of the curriculum pilot project. Following that meeting, Donna agreed to participate in this study, stating she was very keen and interested in curriculum.

We began our conversations in September, 1981 and met five times during the following five months. During the school semester in which we conducted our conversations, Donna was teaching high school food science and was piloting the curriculum revision in food studies 10. Our conversations were limited primarily to a focus on food science (food studies) curriculum. Again, certain themes re-emerged during our conversations and I begin with a portrayal of these themes in Donna's own words.

Teaching seemed to be the logical....

Donna began teaching ten years ago. As she explains:

> When I graduated from high shool, I was uniformly good in all subjects. My dad wanted me to go into computer math. because I was good in math. That was an option. Other people said I would be good in law and that I should think about family law. Things that were related to home economics were my hobby.
>
> There was interest and it seemed sort of natural, given that I was uniformly good in all of the subjects to take the one that I had the most fun at and go and study more in that area. In fact, the years in university I really enjoyed taking most of the material and I found it really interesting.

However at the end of a degree in home economics, Donna found her options for a career were limited. She had taken a general program in home economics and she saw her only real options either in education or agriculture extension.

> When I thought about it, my mum was a teacher and of course the family had been teachers from away back and I thought, you know, that probably was in the back of my mind from the start. Teaching seemed to be the logical...if you knock out any of the other interesting things that were possibilities, teaching was sort of the solid core that you could fall back on and in fact I really enjoyed it.

In Donna's first year of teaching, in the early 1970's, the revised curriculum was introduced. Donna explains her relation to this curriculum in the first years of her teaching:

> I started with a teacher who had lesson plans set up and course outlines set up and we didn't worry about concepts or generalizations or objectives. We just taught the course material in the order that she had always taught it. I continued to do that for two years. The second year changing a bit with the curriculum and the third year I went almost exclusively with the new curriculum because in that time I was feeling sure enough of myself to teach the courses the way I wanted to teach them rather than as it had always been taught in that school.

Donna stated that when she began teaching, she saw skills as being very important in teaching students. The new curriculum of the early 1970's had helped her through focusing on the significance of foods and clothing, to see some new ways of altering her teaching actions.

> I was also more ready to try things after several years of teaching.
>
> I developed myself and that's why. When I grew up it was very standard meals always. We had a large family and we always helped prepare standard meals, preservation and so on. When I was living on my own, I didn't always do the things I always had done previously. You change your own cooking style and you are interested in the things yourself and of course that changes it in the classroom as well. If you don't keep including new things, you bore yourself to death.

Donna enjoyed teaching senior high school classes because as she put it:

> There the ballgame is wide open...I don't know if that's how the curriculum puts it but it's classes interests and my interests and how are we going to approach this and you can change it every year and I have.

Donna had, however, by now, ten years later, begun to think about teaching half time.

> I find that if you are going to do a good job of teaching you end up spending your whole life at it. I don't have the time for crafts now that...I think marriage took a large bundle of time too. When I was single, I could still handle teaching and do a lot of outside things. Now that I find I am married and teaching, I don't have time for a lot of outside things that are enrichment things for me and I don't get the kind of enrichment from teaching that I did at the beginning. I don't find that I'm learning new things as I used to.
>
> Teaching is going to be less and less an important thing in my life.

Donna was married but did not have children. Are home responsibilities shared in her marriage?

> We split things pretty equally though at the moment Jerry has bought his own business so he spends alot more time at that. So if there's someone around the home that puts up the storm windows or washes the outside windows or repairs things, it's me. I do the gardening and the lawn and the...I can expect help but it's not fair at the moment because he's so busy. And neither of us cleans the house. I gave up. I just can't do it in the hours I have available. And given that I work long hours...and Jerry works long hours, the time we have together in the evening is valuable and I don't want to spend it house-cleaning and so we have a housekeeper come in and I'm glad that I have that outlet. I also find that I don't want to be doing homework in the evenings simply because the time is more valuable spent with Jerry.
>
> All the things that I really used to enjoy and the things that I enjoyed doing so much that I became a teacher to teach those things, I'm no longer able to do. And I must say that teaching them has taken some of the enjoyment out of them.
>
> In a way that's part of the whole teacher burnout process. If you have to spend your life drumming things that are automatic to you into the heads of kids that don't particularly want to learn them, then it becomes a bit more

> of a chore. I would appreciate now the time to spend on my own interests.

Donna described other factors which have shaped her state of teacher burn-out.

> The school is a real administration problem too. The discipline hassles and problems are much more evident. The lack of respect for authority.... The continual hassle with supervision and looking for drugs and the paper work that crosses your desk. The checking on attendance and the phoning of every parent when the student is away. There's hours of it, literally hours a week.
>
> And then the marking...every year it's more because I'm teaching larger and larger classes. And looking after a lab. and setting up and ordering groceries and changing recipes over. It's really a full life and it's not concentrated on the more enjoyable parts of it.

Donna was also trying to decide whether to have children. She felt her husband's career was not yet at the point where she could make that choice.

> I really enjoy watching a young child develop and it's always one of those things that's always been in the back of my mind from the time I was very little. I always thought I was going to grow up to be a mother mainly, first.
>
> At the same time, I would like to retain some contact with a lot more adults than just neighbours and to do that, given my background in teaching...it's either going to be in the teaching profession...it's a whole circle of friends that is totally different from the ones that you and your husband share. It's more stimulating in some aspects, because their expectations of you are totally different from the expectations that your common friends have of you.

She was also considering possibly returning to university.

> I wouldn't study any further in education home economics but I wouldn't mind studying, see if I like family law for example and again that would pick up on some of the home economics background.

Doing and being.

Donna's teaching in her food studies course was guided by certain ideals which she held for her students. Her own personal learning style influenced the style of learning she saw as important for her students.

> I've always been more of a practical kind of person than a theoretical kind of person and the Faculty of Education just drove me to distraction with all their lovely theories and never getting any practical....
>
> Kids get a lot of enjoyment out of practical labs. They basically enter with the idea that they are going to have practical labs everyday.
>
> Most students carry a core of courses which involve sitting still in a desk and being quiet. So it (food studies) is a completely different type of program. They enter the vocational, food science, clothing and textiles and art with the idea that they are going to be able to have a more relaxed atmosphere. That they will be able to learn something or practice something that they will be using out side of the school environment. Let's face it, for the rest of their life they are not going to be sitting at little desks reading a book and answering questions. For most of these students, they are not going into a business world.
>
> If we offered a food science course and it was all theory and we never did an entire lab, the next year we would have no one signed up. That's just not why they want to take food science.

Her ideals were formed in terms of the food science program and what she saw it as having to offer students.

> One very important aspect of the way I teach is...trying to have them experiment with their own taste...and to be able to really, really enjoy personalizing their cooking.

Through the food science program students could come to understand and share each other's cultural backgrounds and understand differences.

> We happen to be in a school where we're a bunch of small communities where kids for the first year don't really spread and get to know the kids from the other communities. They tend to stick in their own little groups...and if you have them appreciating what someone else has done, you start to pull them together at an earlier time.

> I try to pull the native kids into that too...it gives them status in the classroom for the other kids to know that they regularly go on hunting trips, that they are quite capable of cooking over an open fire almost anything imaginable.

Donna described her interest in encouraging students to:

> Leave themselves open to try all sorts of new things and to be open to other cultures. If you start with food that's a very standard ground and from there you can say 'Well, they're different. They eat differently but the food is good.' So, therefore, if they act differently, that might be good too or if they take part in a different kind of activity, that might be just as good.

Donna attempts to relate food science ideas to the daily problem situations of the family.

> When I have them answer a question for me on an exam, I try to do it in a problem-solving manner. They don't just have to write down something that they know but that they actually have to solve the problem with what they know. I try to relate it to what they're doing at home and to what they possibly could be doing in later years....

Donna believed that an important aspect of being a teacher was to show kids that you really cared about them but this ideal she found constantly frustrated and almost impossible to achieve.

> You can help to some extent by showing them that they are important people and that you do have the time to talk to them, but still, there are so many kids not getting that kind of help. There are so many kids that need better help than we can give them.

> You are in contact with a large number of teenagers. You have the opportunity to see all sorts of things that you wouldn't see normally. You see cases of incest, you see cases of total breakdown in family situations. You see cases of alcoholism, drugs and peer pressure that I didn't experience when I was a kid.

> It's not difficult to handle as long as you keep yourself disassociated from it, and it's hard to do that. These kids are kids that you react with everyday and they become...well, you talk about them as your kids because you are involved with them and they do, the ones that you have a good relationship with, they speak to you in the hall and

> they continue over the three years that they are here to acknowledge your presence and to search out your company to a certain extent when they have a problem. So you hear all sorts of dreadful things that are happening, things that you cannot help with other than listening to the kid and so there is that aspect which is really depressing. It's not the way I grew up and it's not the way I want my children to grow up and yet you look at it and you say, 'is there any other way?' Given that the pressures...how can you have a kid and lock them away from all that through his teenage years, and so many parents are just really distraught. They come in, they've done everything they possibly can and they have still not affected to any great extent their teenagers development and they're beside themselves. And you say to yourself, 'well god, is that me fifteen years down the line?' So that to an extent is depressing.
>
> I'm just not happy with the state of education outside my own little world. I really think we are not turning out kids that have any real respect for themselves, their community, or each other. They have a hard time developing a self-awareness and self-worth and somehow, I know we can't do everything and that the parents are responsible to some extent but somehow there must be some way that we can help in that development.
>
> I guess by listening to them. Other than that, I feel helpless.
>
> What _can_ I do about a situation where say one of the ones I had last year, a case of incest, what can you do for that little girl? You can only be there when she wants to talk to you. And she's not going to talk to you about that situation. But there are some days when she is going to need somebody to talk to or even this year, I'm finding the student union is a lot more hours because Barry wants to come and spend the hours talking to an adult female. It wouldn't necessarily have to be me, but his mother took off and went to Saskatchewan and he hasn't heard from her since.

Competition is quite tough

Donna had worked during the past several years to individualize the food science program she was teaching. She believed that by setting up individualized modules of study for students that that was one way students could progress through a course at their own level and speed. An individualized program could accommodate students who entered school later in the year, came with a variety of past experiences in home economics or had time-tabling difficulties but still wished to take the course.

> We saw our program gradually getting to where it could be totally individualized.
>
> If they were really interested, they could draw a lot more modules.
>
> So this whole thing of fitting into twenty-five hours, I would have to scrap that and change it over.

Donna relied on understanding of the students' needs and past experience to shape her teaching. Her experience told her that students liked doing things.

> I don't think we are going to get kids into the program unless we have a good portion of cooking. They already think that we don't cook frequently enough.
>
> They're really in there for hands on experience. They're not in there for the information....
>
> We're affecting in a small way their food choices because of the nutritive point of view. We're affecting their food choices from easy preparation of things...now that they've got a bit of experience or they're less reluctant to try new things where they weren't experienced with the method.
>
> The 20's and 30's are really changing their families habits, where they are responsible for a large part of the cooking and any kids who are interested in coming into the 20 or 30 are doing a lot of their families' cooking.

It was important to have student input into what they wished to do in the course.

> I talk to them a couple of days ahead and say we could do this kind of thing or we could do this kind of thing or....
>
> The decisions are made recognizing the students' background.
>
> And sometimes, even if I get negative feedback on something, I will go ahead with it given that my experience

> in the past is that even though they didn't want to do it, they ended up liking doing it.

It was important to keep in touch with students' interests and to do things they wished. The principal of the school, Mr. Cairn, pointed out the competitiveness among electives in the school.

> We have a lot of electives in this school and the teachers of electives really compete for students. If the word gets around that nothing is happening, that you're not learning anything there or that there's too much work or that it's not enjoyable and word gets around, then the numbers tail off. Of course, the incentive to (the teacher) is that if they don't have enough home economics students, they are going to have to teach something else. Competition is quite tough.

Donna along with the other home economics teachers ran a strong program in that students were very interested and enrolments were high.

> What helped us to begin with is that there are no junior high programs in the area so the kids coming in have no background and they are interested in taking something that they haven't taken at junior high.
>
> I'll have fifty or sixty people in here on a day when I am cooking because the kids are wandering in to see what the other kids are doing and...that's how we get a lot of our enrolment, just in the fact that none of us ever get out of our classrooms at noon hours or between classes and we let other kids wander in while we are cooking and have a look and by word of mouth....

The courses were popular with students because they were visible.

> You really have to be responsive to what is happening in the school and what is happening in the kids' lives.

Being responsive to what is happening in the school may mean:

> When there was an outdoor phys. ed. class going out, our kids did outdoor cooking and trailed along with the outdoor phys. ed. and learned from the outdoor phys. ed. while the outdoor phys. ed. learned from the outdoor cooking unit.
>
> We're also out for the drama production. The 30's students cater the supper for the drama kids and they're running a concession...the clothing and textiles students sew

> costumes for drama and get credits for some gorgeous creation that's on stage.

Colleagues in teaching have had some influence on Donna's ideas and action in education.

> I worked with contemporaries rather than people who had been in the business a long time and the contemporaries are usually of my age and so...we've shared ideas but we hadn't had any great influence on each other.
>
> I guess when you look back at your favourite home economics teacher from high school, she was a perfectly groomed elderly lady that had every hair in place all the time and she managed to run modern living, sewing and cooking all in the same class without a hair out of place and without ever getting flustered. We sometimes look back at that image and laugh....
>
> It's an image that you all tend to think that at some point you will emulate...you always strive towards the perfect image but on the other hand, we realize that many of the things that those people did as part of their home economics profession and were proud to do, we wouldn't touch.
>
> In fact, women's liberation, the whole movement, has had a lot to do with the change in the home economics profession. The very idea that it is an art or a science that could be appreciated and learned by both boys and girls was something that was just not done when I started teaching. No boys were allowed into the home economics classes at all and we have come a long way to encouraging say thirty percent of our classes are now boys and there are a lot of schools where it is much, much higher.

4.1.3 Conversation and curriculum: A retrospect.

On one level, curriculum is a plan, an intended act or series of actions, reflecting deliberate and conscious decisions about what and how to teach. These decisions however are grounded on a teacher's personal being and awareness of her own knowing and being. This section of this chapter is a reflective, sense-making effort to push beneath the conversation and to probe toward a fuller understanding of the teacher as being and knower which is the teachers' perspective of curriculum.

The interpretative or sense-making effort which follows cannot be considered as an attempt to generalize, to claim that 'this is it'. It is rather a tentative probing. In the previous section, extensive portions of the teachers' talk were included for the sense of curriculum conveyed in the talk itself. This interpretative section is a search for commonality, a communicative ground, and its limitations, commonality not posing as generalization beyond the relationship of the co-researchers of this study.

• • •

Curriculum is that through which we bring ourselves to form.

Beginning teaching entails a profound altering of one's role, a move from student to teacher, from the led to the leader, from the passive to the active.

> The sense of other people, with mysterious knowledge, controlling your life is what our education system is structured to communicate.
> (Hunt, 1976, p. 121)

I begin to teach. Home economics, the school, both have gone on for years, orderly and directed. Someone knows what should be done.

"Here I am, a new servant. Tell me what to do."

I'm good at following directions, after all, I've been a student for years.

Madeleine Grumet (1981) describes the school as a patriarchal institution in which women enter as teachers to psychically claim the portion of themselves which is their father and to reject their mother. Women enter in order to identify with the father, symbolized as powerful and autonomous and to differentiate themselves in the sometimes smothering relationship with their mother. The structure of the school, formally and informally, demands authority and efficiency, a rejection of caring and nurturing. A transition from student to teacher, from mother to father.

In her first year of teaching, Marilyn had the best start she felt she could have had by relying on her sister's teaching plans for home economics. She knew what to do each day and then "with a little growth", she was prepared to advance beyond the guidance of someone else's plan. Donna followed closely and needed the direction offered by the senior teacher in the department of the high school where she began teaching. She followed the program as it had operated previously until she felt confident about teaching things the way she believed they should be taught. By her third year of teaching, she was "feeling sure enough" of herself.

George de Cuir (1981) describes the first few years of the teachers career as the "honeymoon phase", a phase in which the "personality is not yet in harmony with the new surroundings".

I'm a teacher, a director. I gather my packages, my plans, my files, my guides. I decide what to do. It's me, it's my turn, I'm on. I talk, they talk. I do, they do. The lesson comes back. Inattentiveness, excitement, fascination, rejection.

* * *

Curriculum is that through which relationship is mediated.

I experience the disinterest, excitement, fascination or rejection. A reaction to that which I do with students, a reaction to me. I decide that this works, this doesn't work. I will do it this way, maybe I will try it that way. The subject area becomes me. The subject area as stranger enters and guides me as I guide it. Max van Manen refers to this transformation of the subject matter as a transformation from "object to true subject".

> It is probably less correct to say that we learn about the subjects contained in the school curriculum than that the subjects let us know something. It is in this letting us know that the subject matter becomes a true subject: a subject which makes relationship possible. The subject calls upon us in such a way that its otherness, its it-ness turns into the dialogic other: the "you". In this way our responsiveness, our "listening" to the subject, constitutes the very essence of the relationship of a student with subject matter.
>
> (van Manen, 1982, p. 295)

A common saying is that we never quite know something until we have to teach it. And yet, the knowing something is not so much knowing something about some thing as much as it is knowing about our own selves. The first few years of teaching is a time concentrated on knowing something, a time of entering a relationship with a subject matter, through an active/reflective relationship with students, a transformation from object to subject.

Van Manen states there is a "deeper truth in the statement 'you are what you teach'".

> A math teacher is not (or should not just be) somebody who happens to teach math. No, a 'real' math teacher is a person who embodies math, who lives math, who in a strong sense is math. We often can tell whether a teacher 'is it' or 'fakes it'. We can tell by the way a person stylizes the stuff he teaches. Or we might say that a person who fakes it is incapable of stylizing what he does not embody. When a person says, 'that is not my style', he also means, that is not the way I am, that is not me! The way we stylize a certain subject matter is a telltale for the way we hold it. We may possess a certain amount of information with respect to literature , math, or science, but only the knowledge we embody truly has become part of our very being.
>
> (van Manen, 1982, p. 296)

Curriculum, what we do each day with students is shaped and planned by intense feelings for what is right, what is good, what is appropriate. Feelings which connect student, subject matter and teacher in trust and openness.

> When curriculum is passed through the medium of our bodies as well as our minds, its meaning is enriched with intentions that are lived and felt as well as thought.
>
> (Grumet, 1978, p. 61)

Lived and embodied, curriculum is an orientation to life, a frame which orients but is constantly pushed and urged to re-frame and re-frame again. Transcendence. A drawing forward, beyond the present state of existence, to see other possibilities. In her fourth year of teaching, Marilyn wanted to do something more dramatic. She wanted to test the relationship, to know more of the subject matter and herself. Donna liked to continue to try new things in her teaching or she would bore herself to death.

To frame and re-frame is essentially to pursue understanding, understanding of self and others. Understanding is the very movement of transcendence. Understanding is a pro-ject. A projection of self into the future, tentatively, to claim possibility.

Curriculum as the relationship with students is both felt and thought. The need for love, to feel valued and good is both a demand of and an offering to the student. Marilyn's driving force in her early career was for love. She also saw the need for love as the students' need. "To take and be able to give love is what its all about".

How we see ourselves, our needs and values influence how we see others. They are like me. They need love and caring, support and nurturing. Don't they? They're like me, I'm one of them. I will build a curriculum in which they can experience love, caring and learn something of themselves. Then I may know if they are like me and what I am like. Who am I? Who are we? Ultimately all inquiry leads to these questions (Novak, 1978).

Marilyn's need for love in her own teaching, in human relationships with others has her see love as an important element between teacher and students, parents and children. The "special things happen" when we can relate as caring people with each other and our actions as teacher or student are only the foreground to the main backdrop of love.

Reflecting on her own learning, Marilyn believed that learning only occurred through experience. "What is content?" To speak of content in curriculum made no sense at all. Learning rather occurred through experience, structured around a topic. Learning occurred in the critical questioning of experiences, questioning which would mean critical questioning of events and observations, as well as of self. These were ideals which Marilyn held for herself in her relationship to students and also in relationship to herself. Donna saw herself as always having enjoyed learning in a practical way and this pleasure in doing was what she hoped the students she worked with would also experience. The practical, doing aspects of food science was why students enrolled. They saw their futures as being active and productive in terms of home activities. The change from reading, sitting, and traditional teaching styles of other courses in the school, made food science attractive. Practical within Donna's food science classes promoted values related to personal development. It was through the practical, largely food production and related activities that students gained a greater awareness of themselves and their abilities. The practical offered an opportunity for students to realize themselves in a concrete form in their work. Beyond the opportunities for expression of creativity and intrinsic rewards of food preparation, the cooperation and sharing between students in a food science laboratory provided an opportunity to develop the values of community. Students gained an appreciation of the styles, abilities and individuality of others through their work of food production. Such interaction encouraged an openness to other peoples of different ethnic, cultural or class origins.

The practical-ness of food science is the means through which students can realize themselves and their relationship to others in concrete action. The food science class for Donna allowed her to capture some of the values of sharing, caring and personal development that she considered important in teaching.

Identification for women is rooted in relationship. The original intimate relationship with the mother lingers for the female child, undifferentiated from the mother. Nancy Friday (1977) argued that daughters are taught their caring, nurturing relationships through the mother's own demands for nurturing and caring. Isolated from the rest of society, the mother and daughter are united as the 'other ' in society, in a give and take relationship ultimately rewarded with the daughter confirming the mother's identity through a repetition of the societal role. It is through relationships that women seek to gain some personal command of their lives. They try to understand others as individuals and to identify the others with themselves (Mitrano, 1981).

The relationship which is curriculum, offers the opportunity for experiencing self and self through others in a process of transcending and re-claiming. Our life intimately entwined with students in relationship, we experience as well as experience through them. We speak of teaching and ultimately it is that we teach ourselves. We plan a lesson or experience for students, we guide and shape the event or process, we talk, direct, suggest, encourage, coax and question and it is as much of us as it is of them. As a teacher we experience and we experience someone else experiencing us, uniting self and other.

In the traditional family role, women have been placed responsible for human nurturing, physical, emotional and spiritual. This responsibility has resulted in women's extreme sensitivity to the other in relationships, resulting in what has been described as women's "preoccupation of living through others" (Mitrano, 1981).

> Women have been so encouraged to concentrate on the emotions and reactions of others that they have been diverted from examining and expressing their own emotions.
>
> (Miller, 1976, p. 39)

The sensitivity in relationships and the skills of caring and nurturing have attracted women individually and collectively to teaching. The demands of their family role appear consistent with the demands of the professional role. Biography is the historical context in which is negotiated the demands of personal and professional life, and embodied in the teacher, is revealed as curriculum.

* * *

Donna completed high school, being equally good in all subjects. She considered suggestions from her parents and others about what she might study at university. She chose a program which would interest her. She saw in home economics the opportunity to focus her studies in an area of her interest, things that had been her hobbies, things that focused on the home. However on completing an undergraduate degree in home economics, she found few opportunities for employment. One possibility was education, something that may have been in the back of her mind from the beginning. In the late 1960's, early 1970's, women were still largely following the traditional career options available to them. If they attended university it was largely education or the applied sciences (medical and social related professions) where the opportunities existed. As Donna now states, she had probably from an early age always thought she would grow up to be a mother mainly, first. Home economics provided a program which could further her personal interests and also provide the possibility of a career. Other family members had been teachers and it seemed therefore to be a traditional and acceptable career to follow.

Marilyn came to teaching as a career because she believed it would allow her to find employment throughout the province wherever her husband would choose to work.

Traditionally, women have been socialized or scripted as young girls to see for themselves certain possibilities in their future. With image, emotion and idea, visions are embedded in the developing consciousness of what it means to be a girl and what are the possibilities for a future as a female. From early years in schooling, little girls have learned that it is they who foolishly forget their money and cannot buy the lunch they selected at school, while it is little Jim who laughs and comes to the rescue, bringing the pennies that Patty forgot so she and her friends may pay for their selections. Or it is the little girl who gets lost, only to be found and safely returned home by the 'big policeman'.[1] Such images of being young and female are later solidified with lessons in being a maturing female - sublimely passive, falling into a deep sleep when fifteen years old, lasting for a hundred years, only to be awakened by a prince and 'won' as his bride, and of course to live happily ever after.[2] In Cinderella, the lesson is repeated, the female future will be determined by a male. To be only kind, sweet and pretty, work hard and a prince will fit your delicate, dainty foot into a glass slipper, marry you and live happily ever after.[3]

The fairy tale vision of being female is acted out in real life. Women are expected to work hard, be sweet and patiently wait for a male to marry and to commit one's future. The mass media, and advertising have portrayed women's ultimate happiness in marriage, in relationship, within a suburban nuclear family. Dick and Jane in real life. In the early 1960's, the mass media elevated the United States' first lady Jacqueline Kennedy to a position of heroine to young maturing females. She epitomized youth and beauty, a supporting wife who while she had had a career, she had cast it aside for the role of wife and mother. Like Mrs. Kennedy, young girls coming of age in the mid and late 1960's commonly expected to work only temporarily, or they pursued a career 'just in case' - in case they didn't marry, or their husband died or abandoned them. Certainly the majority of women did not plan a life time career for themselves, nor did they expect that their career could or would take priority over that of a spouse. Women therefore, came to a career decision more through accommodating to a situation and limited options than by single-mindedly pursuing a career goal according to their own talents or desires. Career decisions are pursued in terms

---

1. From Our new friends. Basic Readers: Curriculum Foundation Series. Toronto: W.J. Gage, 1957.
2. From Gray, William S. and Arbuthnott, May Hill, More streets and roads. Basic Readers: Curriculum Foundation Series. Toronto: W.J. Gage, 1957, 195-302.
3. Ibid. 303-313.

of options available in the city or part of the country where a woman finds herself confined because of her decision to marry, which until recently has meant implicitly that for her the marriage would take priority over her career interest.

Within teaching, mothers can accommodate their working hours away from home to those of their children once in school, and this along with the benefits of sharing the same holiday periods with their children, attract and maintain many women in teaching. Catharine Beecher was one of the first to see the parallels between teaching and mothering. She promoted teaching as a career for women for it was desirable training for the 'ultimate superintendency of children' in the family.

Home economics as a subject area contains certain peculiarities for those who teach it. It, unlike mathematics or science, is directly related to the home. Many teachers of home economics enjoy the home activities related to food, clothing and family and teaching home economics provides a unique opportunity to link closely home and work. In other words, the subject matter is the private sphere. A high value is placed on the activity of the home and on family relationships. Embracing the value of human relationships, caring and nurturing, home economics teachers insert into the school system these 'feminine' values. The subject matter focuses on the domestic sphere and adopts the humanistic rhetoric of the education profession. As a subject area, and in its private/family focus, it serves as a counterpoint to the values and structure of schooling itself.

> Hierarchy, status and domination are characteristics of patriarchal mentality. Although teaching is a women's occupation by virtue of the number of women in it, and qualities thought to be desirable in teachers, it is an occupation controlled by men. Because it is a male-dominated occupation, male-defined values permeate it.
>
> (Mitrano, 1981, p. 25)

In the schools, home economics is an optional course which implies that it is not a course of great importance. Male-defined values are evidenced in our schools by the courses which are considered core, academic , or basic. Courses such as mathematics, science, social studies, courses which emphasize objectivity, rationality, abstractness, knowing-separated-from-being. Courses which are described as practical, creative or expressive are of secondary value.

Students bring to home economics a rejection of the theoretical focus of the more valued school courses, and assumptions about the lesser value of home economics and its nature as a practical course. Implicit in the secondary student's experience is identification with male-world values, public oriented, abstractness and competitiveness. Home economics, focusing on the personal and the concrete-dailiness encounters rejection and de-valuation for its practical and feminine values. While on the individual level students reject the theoretical (male) values, socially and symbolically, their identity demands a rejection of the practical (female) values.

> Women are caught in a double bind. If they turn to careers, the ones open to them are the ones which our society devalues. If they attempt to change the reward system by the infusion of values which have been described as 'feminine', they find that these are devalued as well. If they attempt to emulate male-defined success and to seek status within the reward system they will be termed 'unfeminine', even 'sick', they experience the guilt and

> ambivalence which thorough socialization into a role can bring.
>
> (Mitrano, 1981, p. 26)

In private life, women enter marriage, determined to work hard, to have the best marriage there ever could be - clean house, charming children - advertisements, soap operas come true. The home sphere is afterall their responsibility. Home economics graduates have studied about the family, practically trained for this role and the future they will assume.

Donna found that many of the home related activities she used to enjoy have become less enjoyable from teaching them. Teaching has become a task of trying to cram into students heads the things she enjoys but that some students don't find interesting at all.

Marilyn has found the emotional intensity and commitment of her earlier years of teaching, something which she can not maintain in the present phase of her career. She viewed her professional teaching career in two distinctly different phases: pre-children and post-children. Once Marilyn had children of her own, her family became the main focus of love and relating to others. Work became work. Having children altered the emotional needs and energy she brought to her teaching. 'That extra' nurturing and love reverted to the home. Teaching took on the characteristics of the public sphere - "Now, I have other people in my life that I find more important than this school or this curriculum". At the beginning of Marilyn's career she brought to her work and expected from it more of the nurturing qualities traditionally associated with the women's sphere. However as she had a family of her own, it became her prime sphere of emotional reward and she preferred to separate strictly her public/work life from her private/family life. She believed that when children were added to her family and she returned to teaching (which her husband also does), there would be a natural sharing of home and family responsibilities. This, however, had not happened. As a result, efficiency became important to her as a means to cope with the demands of both teaching and home commitments. She saw herself as both the ambitious career person and the main care giver in her family. Her double commitment to her work and her family, however, prevented her from, for the present, seeking advancement in her career. She felt that as much as she tried to break out of her early socialization which trained her to be in charge of the family/home sphere, she could not. While she could think and reason about her actions rationally, emotionally she was tied to expectations of women in home and child care.

Once Marilyn had children of her own, she was able to claim within the school the part of her which is her father. She centered her emotional life in the home and let efficiency be her driving force in her teaching. She embraced two worlds separately, not wanting school to interfere with home, nor home with school. She could leave the caring, emotive world of the home and enter work, free of the exhaustion, uncertainty and entanglements of domestic/personal affairs. At other times she could escape the immense anonymity and bureaucratization, seeking sustenance and self in the intimacy of family. She embraced both worlds.

Donna experienced more contradiction within the school itself; a structure bureaucratic and hierarchical but sustained by humane and nurturing rhetoric. "Beyond her own little world", she was disappointed in the education system's ability to really help those kids who needed it. Family problems carry over into the school and teachers who really care, who see students as their students feel obligated to do something for those students who experience family separation or violence. The school is limited in the caring it can provide. As an efficient, organized system, the demands on teachers is for more and more reports, controlling of attendance, monitoring, evaluating, etc.

Donna found that being married took a large portion of her time. She seeks primarily within her family relationship her personal nurturance and sustenance, wishing as well to separate her teaching from her family. She is considering teaching part time. In any case, she expects teaching to assume a lesser and lesser importance in her life.

Both Donna and Marilyn have in a sense retreated from teaching, investing less of themselves personally in the relationship and seeking rather their identity and emotional sustenance within family relationships.

Home economics teachers regard highly the values of nurturing and caring relationships associated with the home/domestic sphere. Marilyn recognized her socialization as the most difficult to overcome, for emotionally she responded according to traditional expectations of females.

> The culture defines women's responsibility to home and family as her primary one. When home and work obligations

> conflict, the home has to take precedence. Women's self-images are built chiefly around their family roles, whereas men's are conditioned more by occupational roles.
>
> (Simpson and Simpson, 1969, p.206)

Almost a century earlier, Virginia Woolf described her difficulty in emotionally freeing herself from the constraints of her socialization which defined her as female.

> In order to achieve, to write, or even just to be themselves, women have to murder the phantom of the 'angel in the house' (meaning the Victorian concept of feminity) 'always charming, always sympathetic, conciliatory, sacrificing herself daily to others'.
> (Dyhouse, 1981, p. 360)

In the same era, Winnifred Holtby stated:

> This tendency to consider everybody else's interests more important than their own is one of the major expressions of women's inferiority complex. When a woman believes enough in her own mission to be ruthless...then, indeed, something happens. But most women dread before anything 'to cause an upset' or inconvenience a family; and their work suffers.
>
> (quoted in Dyhouse, 1981, p. 36)

With the advancement of capitalism, factory production took over much of the material production which had formerly occurred in individual households and cottage industries. As industries were established, work was defined as occurring outside the home, in factories, mills, mines, etc., and as wage labour for males. Women's position in society was to be in charge of the domestic, home sphere, responsible for daily re-vitalizing of the labouring male household head in a nurturing, supportive, 'haven of love' so he could return on successive days to sell his labour in the marketplace.

> Women came from a position in which their own nature was defined for them by others. Their selves were almost

> totally determined by what the dominant culture believed it needed from women and therefore induced women to try to be.
>
> (Miller, 1976, p. 118)

Within the family, women assumed caretaking duties, supporting and nurturing husbands and children in an unpaid labour capacity, and in turn supporting the capitalist economic arrangements of which the family was a part. Through the dominant modes of societal ideology, women's role has been defined for them as nurturer, as upholders of morality, as consumer expert, as home manager, etc. Capitalist economic arrangements have been effective in separating the public/male sphere and the private/female sphere, each based on opposing values or as also claimed, a substantially different consciousness (O'Brien, 1981).

Women live in both the school and the family as the 'other' in structures not of their own making but of their own maintenance. Women entered the teaching profession to claim their fathers, but they entered on the invitation of superintendents and trustees who wished to claim their mothers (Grumet, 1981). In this sense, the traditional male-female relationships are produced and reproduced in our schools with the dominant structures and values being patriarchal/male and the professional rhetoric and 'sentimentalized' values being female. Women have been defined by the dominant male power group both within the family and the schools.

> Such definitions by a dominant group are inevitably false...such definitions are grossly distorted by the dominant's own unresolved problems and dilemmas.
>
> (Miller, 1976, p. 118)

Donna entered teaching because she saw the opportunity to link her own interests in home activities with a career. In teaching, the professional ideology in support of nurturing and caring was consistent with the values of women's role in the home. However after years of experience the school reveals itself as a male-dominated, bureaucratic organization valuing control, authority and report writing more than the teacher-student relationship. For home economics teachers, the human values associated with the home are likewise devalued in the school setting.

Within the personal family sphere, for women, the early dreams and hopes of a perfect family and home result in disillusionment and a sense of confinement and a loss of autonomy within the domestic role. The little value which society places on domestic work is realized. Women's role is revealed as ideology, emotionally confining women in domestic service to others. For home economics teachers, the appeal of integrating home and work interests becomes a double bind. Can a subject area based on the family domestic sphere be 'freeing' and inspire transcendence?

Within the past century, both waves of feminism have been attempts for women to gain their autonomy and to direct their own destinies, or in the curriculum terms we have been pursuing, to claim their own situation in order to realize possibilities. As more women have entered the public labour force, they have encountered the double duty of domestic and paid labour. They have also experienced the contradictions between the values of the public and private spheres. The embracing of both worlds creates intense contradiction in the individual person.

> The advantage man enjoys, which makes itself felt from his childhood, is that his vocation as a human being in no way runs counter to his destiny as a male.... He is not divided.
>
> (de Beauvoir, 1974, p. 758-9)

The valuing and affirming of the female experience within the current feminist movement encourages women to advance and transcend rather than retreat. The movement as a whole has altered women's consciousness.

Traditionally, women have retreated to their homes, to separate public from private, self from social, to see the personal as personal and private. However, within the current feminism is the illustration that the personal is political. Each problem we encounter in human relationships and the family is connected to public policy, social values and arrangements. The private reverberates on all societal levels, despite the individualistic, private rhetoric which maintains isolation and alienation in society (Caplan, 1981).

Curriculum as a lived orientation through which relationship with others is mediated is the entry of the private into the public. The thinking, acting individual embodies curriculum. For women seeking autonomy in society, the struggle is similar to the seeking of autonomy (claiming of curriculum) in the world of the school. It is a desire to connect the split between public and private, thinking and acting. The desire to claim a situation which is lived but defined by the other dominant group or ideology.

Certain points and actions indicate the potential for curriculum growth and realization. The teachers' early dedication to values of nurturing and caring is a resistance against the de-humanizing, bureaucratic organization of the schools. The shaping of courses to encourage experiential learning represents a valuing of the individual's experience and development. This early resistance encounters limitations in the dominant patriarchal values of the school and society, and in the emotional demands too great to be maintained over a long period of time, particularly once one's own family draws similar demands.

Home economics, as a subject matter, links the private sphere with the public. The contradictions between the two spheres are experienced as devaluation in the schools by home economics teachers. As a 'subject', home economics has the potential to lead the teacher to penetrate the limitations which contain and confine curriculum. Within the subject itself, contradictions between the 'content' and the teaching approaches provide an opening to reformulate curriculum. The contradictions between family theory and the family as lived provides additional openings for reformulation. Home economics focuses on the family, a microcosm of the society in which the male-female relationship and its opposing values are confronted and negotiated. To claim curriculum in home economics is to claim possibility personally and socially.

Behind, through and around our conversations, curriculum was spoken as we talked of the influences which altered and shaped the daily action in the classroom. Daily action is grounded in the personal situation, the teacher as being and knowing. As that through which we bring ourselves to form, curriculum springs from the personal dynamic, the hope, possibility, and imagination our life inspires. As the form of our being, it is revealed in biography, personal and professional, the merging and reflection of one in the other. As that through which relationship is mediated, curriculum entwines teacher, student and subject matter in an inquiring relationship, inquiring of self and other, of self in other. Our personal, self understandings are projected into the relationship of working with students. Our needs, and understanding of knowing and being form the relationship of learning with students. We see them through our knowing of ourselves.

As knowing and being, the teachers' perspective of curriculum both is and is more than. The essence of being is the constant project, urging and pressing for emergence - something new - transcendence of self and situation.

This exploration of the teachers' perspective of curriculum projects new questions and issues about curriculum and more specifically about home economics curriculum. Before raising these questions and issues, however, I will turn to the second dimension in which the teachers' perspective is explored, the experience of participating in the curriculum pilot project.

4.2 EXPERIENCING THE CURRICULUM PILOT PROJECT

This section of the chapter turns to the second focus of my conversations with the teachers, talking about curriculum through reactions to their participation in the pilot project. Curriculum as hopes, desires, and beliefs is affected also by context, the situation in which it is located. Curriculum as a focus of interest originated with the desire of educational administrators to alter or change school programs. As indicated in chapter three, the curriculum perspective evident in planning for the pilot project can be characterized as bureaucratic and instrumental. The teachers' perspective is not unaffected by this contrasting perspective of curriculum. Curriculum as situation entails confronting and negotiating this alternate perspective, the bureaucratic-administrative perspective from which 'curriculum' is named.

In claiming curriculum as one's own, it is necessary to understand not only the thing but the process by which curriculum is negotiated and brought to form. In this sense, this section offers a critical reflection on the previous section, an exploration of the context or situation in which ideals and beliefs are influenced.

4.2.1 To question and say no.

When Marilyn heard there was a need for teachers to pilot the curriculum revision, she volunteered to pilot clothing and textiles 10. She believed both her clothing and textiles and modern living courses needed revising. However, since there are not many modern living teachers in the province, Marilyn was asked to pilot a modern living (personal living skills) course. She described her work in piloting as:

> I am really attempting to revise the modern living 20 course to make it acceptable to me, to make it acceptable to the new environment as far as the school goes and to try and do it into somewhat the mould that has been set out in the new curriculum.

Marilyn was open to the revised curriculum because she believed it offered some needed organization and structure.

> I do like clean beginnings. I like clean ends. I like modules or units or unipacs. I don't like twenty-five hours. I believe in a nice clean, tight structured course but you cannot, it just doesn't work. You can't do it all in twenty-five hours. And I don't believe that our teaching should start off with that as being the basic premise and then we try and teach from there.
>
> Some things seem to take a shorter period of time than other things and by making an unnatural condition first, I'm wondering...what the whole purpose of the whole thing is? If we are trying to make education more sound then that doesn't seem sensible.
>
> All I think they can do is perhaps come up with what some core things should be in a course and some time limitations to allow you your own teaching style.

Marilyn expressed extreme frustration from the second meeting, a frustration which centered on what she believed piloting a curriculum was about.

> I think there is a need for inservices, there is a need for workshops. There is a need to give people stimulation, say 'try this, I've tried it', that kind of thing. But I do not believe that is what should be happening in those meetings, nor do I believe that us oldies (teachers) should be doing that thing to the new ones.
>
> I don't think at this stage of the game when you are piloting a course you should be worrying about what to do Monday morning.
>
> To me, piloting is working through some basic premises they set up for us like the twenty-five hour module which I have already decided won't work. But I have said I will try that and I'm going to do my twenty-five hours the best I

> can even though I think my mind set is already that I don't think it is the best way to go.
>
> I obviously shouldn't have piloted. I think the conclusion was that I am not the best person to pilot because I don't do well. I just get totally frustrated with all these imperfections or these things that I don't agree with like how they have started the whole business, obviously I didn't realize. I don't agree with that and I think that there are some grave limitations on the results just because of how it was set up.

During the last hour of the morning sessions of the second meeting with the piloting teachers, there was open discussion on some of the problems teachers had experienced during their first month of teaching.

> I thought it was a valuable session, frustrating, frustrated me to no end but I don't think that frustration is always bad. It was one of the few times when we have all been able to speak about things we have thought about and sort of come to conclusions about and be able to share those ideas and say, 'hey, that's exactly what I'm feeling', and so I think it was from what I gather or I felt, that portion of the session was indeed what I think should be happening. But they allowed a certain amount of time for that and then that was the end. As I said, its just a general frustration with the whole process. I'm just finding it more and more difficult and I've never been good at fitting into the right moulds. And that's been one of my problems with home economics right from the beginning, I don't seem to find these things very easy and so I usually end up opting out, not because I don't think I haven't a contribution to make or can't learn a lot, I just find them horrendously frustrating often, and I think why bother?

Drawing on her beliefs and ideals about education, Marilyn placed her frustration and reaction in a broader context.

> I think that we are all just a million miles apart. It is impossible to converse on the same level if you're not at the same level.
>
> I for a long time have realized that education and home economics especially has very few critical thinkers. People who are really able to analyze the essence of what is happening and discuss that. And maybe I'm wrong but I think that I'm a critical thinker. And therefore I get

> really frustrated talking with some really delightful ladies who do an excellent job of teaching but who never really question what it's all about. Who never really say 'geezz, what is this?'
>
> To me education is more than discussing what we do on Monday morning in our lesson plans. That is the last kind of conversation I want to have. Just because I think there are so many broad things to talk about.
>
> Some of us are interested in the whole process, we are not just interested in filling in learning resources. It's too bad that's where the pages need to be filled up but that's not necessarily where we're all at as far as our needs.
>
> In piloting, I think that you do seriously question it all or you're not really piloting.
>
> And I think it's an awfully good exercise. I think it's been positive in lots of areas. The amount of energies I've spent on curriculum this year has been positive. To question and say no is still positive.

At the same time Marilyn was piloting the personal living skills 20 course, she was also interested in revising her clothing and textiles 10 course. She became involved in an 'informal pilot' project in which the clothing and textiles teachers from both urban school systems met periodically to discuss common problems and their reactions to the proposed revisions.

> We talked for an hour and a half. No one had any trouble, just...because there were no vested interests or agendas or anything. Everyone just sort of looked at this curriculum and said, alright what do we like, what don't we like. It was really a productive hour and a half.

Meeting with the group of teachers in the informal pilot was helping Marilyn to see some alternatives for clothing and textiles.

> It's like clothing is so close to me that I can't step out of it and see what is wrong anymore. It's as if I've been caged but maybe it's because I've had it at junior high; I took clothing at senior high school, I went though the clothing program at the university, I did alot of my graduate work in clothing. I mean it's like I have this incredible background that is doing me more damage than good.

> We just can't see beyond what we are doing here anymore and maybe there isn't too much worthwhile doing. And maybe after some research we just may not have a third course.

The next time Marilyn and I conversed, she spoke more of her reasons for participating in the curriculum pilot projects, both formal and informal.

> I'm an achiever...I get some ego strokes.... I like recognition...and I also get to a point in my own curriculum development that I need some shots in the arm and being forced to do something and after I volunteer, I feel forced into it, then I structure some things and it's good for me.

The informal curriculum pilot was most inspiring for Marilyn. She spoke enthusiastically of the possibility of designing an experimental course in clothing and textiles. Within the group she was able to gain recognition she sought and also work out problems she had felt for some time with clothing and textiles.

> I rarely work unless it brings me something.
>
> I think that I have a lot more to offer in curriculum in this province than most people do. I think that's where my real strength is, is in curriculum and because I'm an organizer, but the organizer is just the added little feature of being able to...and I think I have lots and lots of thoughts about curriculum and I don't have difficulty in putting all those things together in an organized fashion and so for me some of these meetings are good because sometimes I don't have a need to share those thoughts and sometimes I do.

We had our next conversation several weeks after the piloting teachers had again met with the department of education consultants. Marilyn's frustration with the piloting teachers' meetings was more intense and her disappointment in the project was evident.

> I find it almost intolerable. I'm so tired by that point (noon) and usually angry.
>
> I find it extremely frustrating and I think very, very little has been accomplished for the amount of time, energy

> and monies that has been spent. And given that time, money and energies and given some proper direction, I think an awful lot could have been achieved and is achievable, but writing a few films, learning resources and guest speakers is not my idea of a good amount of results for all that energy. And I think that's all that is going to be achieved by the whole experiment or endeavour or whatever, and it's just not enough for me.
>
> The piloting ladies...have been given a narrow task and they are doing that narrow task but had they been given a broader task, they would have worked equally hard and given the right questions and allowed the right scope of those questions, they would have indeed been able to deal with an awful lot of good curriculum questions as opposed to filling in the blanks about what film you show. To me it's a whole different level of thinking and they are not allowing us to think and they are saying that this thinking has already taken place ahead of time and we're not supposed to do that kind of thinking and I don't buy that. It may or may not have been done ahead of time.
>
> It's like that in the teaching field. There are perfectly decent teachers around who allow a certain scope of thinking in their classes who achieve that scope of thinking and everybody is quite content and happy as I think most of the home economics teachers are in piloting but that is not to say that there is not a wealth of knowledge that is still untapped and giving your kids the opportunity to try and deal with that kind of thinking that they couldn't achieve that as well.

Marilyn described how she deals with her extreme frustration.

> It just isn't worth all this energy to me. I mean I can do my own thing without any of them. And so that's why I'm just wiped out by noon. A lot of things can be accomplished without them. And so, I usually end up deciding well, alright, forget it you guys. I'll do exactly as I please and I will accomplish exactly as I please. And I will.

While Marilyn expressed extreme frustration with the official pilot project, she was very enthusiastic and excited about developing and teaching an experimental course the following year in clothing and textiles.

> We're calling it strictly a locally initiated program.
>
> Actually Jo-Ann (principal) is as much an instigator of the course as I am. It's just that we're doing a good job of

> working it out, agreeing with each other, but she is very keen on it because she also recognizes the fact that nothing is happening in clothing.
>
> We're not proposing that this be the course. We just thought that this is a way that we want to go, perhaps two or three of us doing something would be of value. If they (the courses) are all awful, we can reject them all, we really haven't lost a great deal because the kids will still have learned something whether we decide it's what they should learn or not.
>
> Given a totally new thing to attack, I'll have lots of fun with it and I'll be keen to do it and I won't feel any kind of past restrictive kinds of things.
>
> Maybe we will indeed be able to look at this course and I think that at this point that that is all we are asking. Just to re-examine the course.

Our final conversation occurred after the end of the first semester and after the last meeting with the piloting teachers. It was a meeting which reflected back on the experience in the piloting project and on our previous conversations.

Marilyn described her reaction to the final meeting.

> I'm sure nothing happened differently the last time than has happened all along. I think it's a farce and I think it's a gross waste of all our energies and I come away every single time just absolutely hysterical almost because it's just so awful. It takes me two or three days before I even unwind. You know, I sleep with it and yet I come away also feeling very, very, upset with myself because...because the way I do things. I cannot very often do a good job of...like I think I was as responsible, probably more responsible than most people there for trying to make some changes and yet I cannot seem to do it because I get so angry and so.... I cannot seem to get that change to occur and yet I think I am very responsible for that change to occur because by and large they are all a group of followers and they don't question very much but I think given some opportunities to consider, they would. I've always seen myself as being a little more able to question and thereby at least take some kind of initiative in that kind of conversation and there hopefully by...but that didn't happen and that's my shortcomings that I find frustrating because I don't do a very good job of that some of the time.

> Nothing was accomplished, absolutely nothing and the more I'm aware of what happened, the more limiting I think it was. At the end when we realized that the foods people had never met, the clothing people had never met, there was no conversation about curriculum. There was such a narrow, narrow emphasis that we were allowed to deal with and there were no openings at all to talk about what it was all about. We were never allowed to talk about what kinds of things we were coming up with in the modern living stuff. We weren't allowed to interact on just a pure interactive basis. It was always so structured and narrowly structured. If you ask only these questions you will only get these answers and that was all that was wanted of us and I found that obviously just totally unacceptable to my way of thinking. So much just a total waste of time.
>
> It was like rubber stamping someone else's work and adding a filmstrip in and that's not what I think that group was capable of...to me it's just a gross insult.

The final recommendations from the modern living group were that a course should consist of from three to seven modules which would mean a considerable alteration from the proposed five modules of twenty-five hours. Marilyn believed however that the conclusion reached in the group would not be accepted.

> We all sort of came to this general conclusion.
>
> We worked together actually as a group and if anything...it was really quite a casual kind of....
>
> I'm sure it won't even, I'm sure it will never grace...the books will never see what kinds of things we said and yet that was really the general feeling of us all and I think we thought it would be very workable.

Marilyn related her experience to how she views herself in relation to her profession.

> I think if anything it has totally reinforced my feeling that I am not a home ecer in that sense and I have always felt alienated from the group and it further alienated me from the group.
>
> More than anything it has reinforced what I believe in and what I value. For a long time now in my old age if I can call it that, I have tried and I think I have mellowed into thinking that I have been too much of a complainer, too

> much of a negative, too much of a cynic about all these sorts of processes and I have mellowed and I have tried to give what I consider some of these bureaucratic structure kinds of things an opportunity and this was the final opportunity. As far as trying to do something that I thought was sort of very group like and...it was just a very bad mistake. I will not do it again because I cannot function in those sorts of groups. Nor can I contribute or bring anything and I believe truly that no one up there is interested in what education is all about which is what I cynically thought all along, and that they don't really want to find out, don't really want to...they perceive the world very differently than I do.

Marilyn compared the approach to curriculum she experienced with her own classroom ideals.

> It's like limiting a child's growth. You can teach in a way that you sit down, I tell you, you write down, you give it back to me. That is teaching in a sense. They may not have really discovered or grown a thing, whereas if sometimes you just sometimes allow them to consider the things, they will indeed come up with some answers and they are going to be far more profound and far more meaningful than anything you could ever sort of have given to them. The same sort of thing happens in curriculum. When you yourself have worked through it and have come up with it and have kind of evolved, I think you have a meaningful curriculum and a meaningful education thing, but that isn't happening. I don't know if it's just a problem of home economics, certainly it's much more so in home economics than in any other field but....

Although Marilyn described the process as being a "mind boggler to me" and a "feeling of total inadequacy on my part", it "has not been a negative".

> The piloting sort of keyed me up again to deal with curriculum more so than I have been for a few years. I was fairly stagnant, if that's the correct word, in doing much and sort of carrying on much as I had when I initially started. It's been super in making me re-look at a lot of, not all but certainly on a broad scale, two of the areas I teach and that's really good. I spent an enormous amount of time thinking and interacting about home economics curriculum. There's been some good conversation that I've had with some people and some good thoughts about the whole process. I think some good things have been happening.

Marilyn reflected on the good things she believed were happening in the informal pilot of the clothing and textiles project.

> It was a small group we were working with, eight or nine usually, which is a very workable group. Afterwards I tried to analyze why things were happening there...they are all kind of our age. I found that interesting and I think there is something to that. I think you have to go a certain way to come up with those sorts of things. We're all there knowing that we didn't have anything in it for ourselves. There isn't any ego at stake, we are just truly interested in doing a better job of this area because we all thought there was some lacking in the area. Nobody had a course in mind but we all knew there was some trouble and let's deal with some of those troubles. I don't think any of us knew where it was going to lead but we all knew that something had to happen. There was always an agenda but we were allowed to work through the steps and they took a large portion of time sometimes. I don't think it's actually going to die.
>
> I have found those meetings very positive and very helpful and good fun.

She believed the official curriculum pilot had stimulated a lot of energy and interest in curriculum.

> You have to say that that is because of the piloting because if it wasn't for the piloting, we in the separate and public boards wouldn't have been meeting together to discuss curriculum because piloting has obviously initiated a lot of conversation. It hasn't been a loss for me in the sense that I am going to be doing something. We'll see where it goes and where it leads and maybe some other things will happen too. It's always hard to know what the spinoffs are of these things and sometimes the spinoffs don't show right away.
>
> I have found these sessions (our conversations) part of the same thing. There have been three predominant things I have done...the piloting, these sessions and the joint sessions. The whole combination has made me deal a lot more with curriculum. I don't think it has altered my values very much but it has certainly got one doing things again or considering things again or trying things again and that is certainly very positive.

What have we done in these sessions?

> Just discussing curriculum. It's just another little tool to keep me thinking about curriculum all the time. There is hardly a month goes by that something in curriculum hasn't happened that you have to go and consider whatever

> it was to consider and that's good. You know, that's really good.

We considered change and how much she was affected personally by the project that she might change her teaching.

> I think it's perfectly reasonable. Like, how much do we change? How much do we as a ...I guess it's self-preservation when you reinforce what you believe in.

How do we get better programs?

How is our thinking affected?

> By a personal level. Not how we see what we do but...it's not so much what we teach as how we go about that kind of process. I'm as guilty as anybody.
>
> I have been an experiential kind of learner and a believer of that for a lot of years now and that hasn't altered. That was because of happenings that happened to me and my life and that doesn't say a thing. That doesn't mean that I do that all of the time or enough of the time.
>
> I think that believing something and being able to do something about that are not always the same thing and sometimes it requires energy...but for sure if we go on an experiential kick, it costs a lot of money. You know when we give a personalized education service to somebody, that means an enormous amount of money because time is money, people are money. I mean, money comes to be the very crucial essence of it all and sometimes you can do that without money depending on your kind of energy levels and stuff but our curriculum does not lend itself to that sort of very, very special kind of education. You know we talk about class size, I think it is very, very crucial. How can you have kindergartens with thirty five year olds and expect to accomplish anything worthwhile for those five year olds. Classes of forty-five in a social studies 10, I mean it gets down to talking...the conversations have to take so many wide dimensions, there's curriculum and then there is reality. You know, I think it's so hard to...blue sky dreaming is really positive and I think that I am certainly capable of a lot of that but actually sometimes doing that....

So you are saying that situational factors limit very much your blue sky dreaming, in other words numbers of kids, that sort of thing?

> But maybe that's not right either, maybe it's a cop-out to make you think that you can't do it. Like why do I believe one thing and do very much the norm in some cases, like, I don't know. And maybe we have to deal with, maybe it's good that most of the world deals with curricula in a very systematic, like these thirty or thirty-five bodies sit there and I do it to you and....

> Why would that be good?

> Because maybe there is no opportunity...I don't know.

Marilyn described a recent conversation with her colleague who has been, as she states "the mover in my curriculum thinking".

> We got to talking about kindergarten classes and he said he was going to use the example of a kindergarten class and right from day one these kids are taught that they are not to make a decision, that they are not to question anything that they are socialized into a very specialized stream of things and he is of course totally of the wrong way of thinking and he says that somewhere we have to take a stand and we all, as individuals, we have to say that this is not good enough and we have to all do our thing as little or as big as we can to alter that because he says we are all responsible for the Clifford Olsons of the world. They were in your class or my class or someone's class. Why did that happen? We are all responsible, personally not as a mass but personally for those kinds of people and those kinds of behaviours and we are all responsible for everyone of these robots we have sitting around in our classrooms and it's not good enough to say 'but I don't know what to do about it. The classes are too big'. He says, 'You do something about it if you believe that that is wrong'. Taking that kind of stance, how many of us are adequate? It's just mind boggling. I don't do anything. I don't. I'm very guilty of telling kids you do this, you do that, and you do it now and don't....Like I don't know where to go with that. Like, believing is one thing and I think I am a good believer and I have my beliefs well thought out and I can articulate those beliefs but maybe I am 99% of the time no different than all those other people that I put into that other category who I don't even think are thinkers about the subject. So it doesn't help. I always think it's an exercise in feeling inadequate, like how on earth do you move these mountains?

> And there are mountains to be moved. Great big mountains to be moved and I'm not doing anything about moving those mountains. And to be a good enough teacher in this man's eyes and I buy it. I buy it always. You have to do something. And if you don't do anything, you are as guilty

> as the people who don't even know that they're doing nothing.
>
> I think there is such a great need for people like him because he truly does make you stand up and say 'What the hell are you doing?' 'Well, I'm not doing anything, dear.' 'Why are you not doing anything.'
>
> It comes down to ultimately who you are. Are you who you think you are or what you do? Are you what I see or are you what you see? Am I the teacher that I think I am or the teacher that it appears I am? That makes no sense at all?
>
> I see myself as being a critical thinker. I see myself as being a questionning sort of teacher. I see myself as being able to do experiential kinds of things with my students, but am I? I'm not asking that of you nor am I asking anyone else but I'm saying - who are we in the sense of if you don't do these things are they real? Like if you do not actually yourself take that one step to move that mountain...?
>
> And I think at the end of your life a composite of what you've done is what you are, not what you thought you were. Not what you've thought you've done but what you have done.

4.2.2 Work for education people

Donna hoped that through participating in the curriculum pilot project, she might once again become more interested and enthusiastic about her teaching and that this would transfer to her students.

> I find that the longer I teach and the more classes at junior level I teach, the less I learn myself and the more boring it becomes to me and you almost feel like you put your mind in neutral and you can handle it all in memory. You don't really have to be there in mind. You can do it all without alot of preparation or without alot of thought.
>
> So basically it was a way of making myself interested in the curriculum again or interested in what I was doing in the junior grades.
>
> I thought if I started with the new curriculum, if there are some new either ways of looking at things or new materials that work well, or new areas to teach, then I

> would become interested again in grade ten, because a good part of my teaching day is spent with grade ten.

Donna was selected for piloting the food science 10 curriculum revision. She and her co-worker had developed the program they were teaching with their students and had attempted to standardize it somewhat within the department so students had a common background. After teaching and modifying their programs for four years she felt very confident that it was a good program.

> You are sure that it covers everything that your students need to have and you sort of worked everything into it and you have taken all the wrinkles out of it, to you that's the best program going and so you are continuously surprised when you go to another school and see them doing something totally different and still meeting the needs of their students. So, I'm working with sort of a bias, knowing at the same time that I have to control the bias so that I can follow the new curriculum as closely as possible, otherwise I cannot critique it.

Donna was somewhat cynical about the direction of the curriculum revision in moving into a modular format.

> I've never really been that interested in educational philosophy. In the years that I have been teaching, I've noticed that whatever basically the United States has done, we do, whether or not it's failed in the states. I worked through the era of open classrooms and it had already failed pretty well in the states.... We all pretty well knew it was failing in the states and yet we were still building open classrooms.
>
> So far as educational philosophy, there is a real loss of faith. I really think that most people who are developing their educational philosophy should get back into the classroom and learn about the real world as it's happening and not just blindly follow some theory that hasn't been...without any real practical knowledge about how that theory is going to work. I think a lot of curriculum planning and alot of educational philosophy simply has never looked at what's happening in the classroom.

Donna's loss of faith in educational philosophy relates to her own experiences in undergraduate education. She began teaching, feeling,

> Totally unprepared for teaching as it was when you came out of university. For all the year that you spent there, you might as well have forgot it when you actually got into the classroom situation.
>
> When you are totally unprepared and you spend so much time getting yourself organized and totally at a loss as a new teacher, that by the time you start thinking about educational philosophy, you are five years out in the field. And then you have come to the realization that all that fine philosophy didn't help you one single bit and so you are cynical about it.
>
> It's so strange because teachers who are doing the teaching at the university, a great number of them were classroom teachers at some point.... So those people who you thought would be best prepared to teach a class of students and make the first years of experience in the schools a better one are so far along the line now that they don't even remember what the experience was like or how to combat it or how to prepare teachers for it and so most of that preparation is done in the school.

During the second meeting with the piloting teachers, when there was opportunity to discuss problems, Donna was particularly questioning of the idea or expectation of implementation.

> I talked to a number of people afterwards because I thought...I was being too vocal and that maybe I should be quiet...and let things fall as they may....
>
> All those people said...'Oh, no, you are expressing exactly what I feel'.
>
> Concerned with the idea that given there are so many questions that the teachers had about the module and why the twenty-five hour module, I had the feeling that if there wasn't some reaction to it, those questions and some solving of those problems that we were going to have the same problem with this curriculum as the last. People would look through it and then do their own thing and they wouldn't worry about twenty-five hour modules.
>
> The only thing that is going to do it in the end is if the twenty-five hour module is set up so that it is realistic and useful and then people will set their programs up that way. That is alot of work for us all to change our programs to set it up that way. There has got to be some incentive that makes you want to do it and if your answer

> is only going to be because the education system thinks that twenty-five hour modules are great, who's going to do the work? Nobody. So first of all, you got to have some real reason as to why this is good.
>
> I thought that alot of the questions being raised were ones that we can solve by re-structuring some of the curriculum. Yet I didn't get the idea from the people who have been working on the curriculum that they really wanted much restructuring. I think that's a problem we have to face in that we all think that our courses are really well set up and they are reacting to the needs of the students where we are working and all of our programs are different. Yet, the people who have done the curriculum also think that they have set up an almost perfect curriculum. But they set it up from what they were doing in the classroom and from questionnaires coming in from over the province. But each of us is bringing a bias. The curriculum people have a bias as well because it's their baby and we are wanting to change their baby and we are criticizing their baby.
>
> The people at the meeting were really anxious that all the work they were doing would show up in the final curriculum, that all the searching for resources, all the background materials, all the suggested activities or a good selection of them would show up in the actual curriculum and we didn't get that reassurance.
>
> I don't think that they (department of education) thought it was going to be that big of a problem, the kind of bias that we were all bringing and it is a big problem....

Donna believed some compromise was necessary between what was proposed in the curriculum revision and the bias that each of the piloting teachers brought to the task.

> They have to decide what is important first and I think that was done by survey basically.
>
> It comes through in bits and pieces...looking at it, I don't agree with it.
>
> I went away rather dissatisfied with how the questions were answered, I guess. I would like to have been reassured that yes, all the work you do is going to change this and I didn't get that reassurance.
>
> I think most home economics teachers...unless you catch a brand new class and send them out armed with the curriculum as it is now rather than the curriculum as we have been used to working with it, you won't get a total change.

> Because we are simply going to continue to do it the way we think works best. And if that isn't reflected in the curriculum, then we will say the curriculum is very interesting but there it sits.
>
> I'm hoping that there will be a compromise but...I'm hoping that whatever the compromise works out to be that it's one that people will actually use and it's one that students will become more and more interested in taking.
>
> What is being taught right now is valuable but I am hoping that we can reach a greater number of students.

For Donna, the meetings with other piloting teachers were helpful and stimulating.

> I just find it incredibly useful. I really wish we could get together with teachers from all over the province in workshops like that on a continual basis.
>
> I go to my conventions and so on and I don't really go to listen to the speakers. I go to talk to other people about what they are doing in the classroom. I go to get ideas on resources that they have found that I haven't and that I have found and they haven't. We swap ideas and really a convention becomes a great sort of visitation and workshop among all the people I know and meet.
>
> It's the informal, the stuff that's really, really valuable and while the topic may be interesting it may be enlightening, they only serve as a basis to start a conversation, to go further on or in another direction. For that reason I really, really found our second meeting very valuable....
>
> Although we may not be doing it exactly according to department plans, we are each changing our own viewpoint on how things should be taught and what's important to teach and what isn't. I imagine you will see a great change in all of the people that are there and when they go back to the classroom, that change will remain.

Donna believed that a curriculum document served a purpose for teachers at a particular phase in their own development.

> I find that the curriculum is a valuable tool especially for beginning teachers because it is hard to decide on your own what information is important and what isn't until you get to know the students a lot better and get to know their background more. But to sit down with the background knowledge in yourself but not sure what the kids'

> background is and try to fit all the things that you think are important into a course for them is really difficult unless you have a curriculum to look through and to look at what skill levels are suggested at which grades and so on. I think it should be taken as a guide because as you gain more experience you may find that your particular group of students need to have more emphasis in one module than in another.

The idea however of a twenty-five hour modularized program [illegible]d limitations which Donna resented.

> I still am finding myself to resent it because in the actual sense I'm the one who is in the classroom, that can see what the kids are needing, what they are appreciating and to go by the set formula and say that we will do this for twenty-five hours and if I have to stop in mid-sentence, that's all the time we've got and that's it. I object to that.

A curriculum guide however, can be useful even to an experienced teacher.

> It's a useful experience to have a new curriculum and to go back to the curriculum and compare my program with what I'm supposed to be teaching and I think that is really valuable no matter how long you've been teaching because you tend to shift to your own emphasis and eventually you may shift far enough away that when you go back you may find that there is a whole section that you haven't been teaching.

Donna's decisions of what and how to teach depended on numerous factors that were not reflected in any centrally planned curriculum guide.

> It depends a lot on really mundane things like time of the year.

> If I wasn't doing the new curriculum, I have a set of individualized programs and we can just move through them at a steady pace and I inject the special things from here and there and that's how I get my own interest...'cause I can do different things with different classes.

Our next conversation was after the third meeting of the piloting teachers. It was near semester end, meaning that the pilot project was coming to an end and Donna had almost completed the piloting of the food science 10 course.

> I am still not convinced that twenty-five hour modules mean anything in particular. I think that whoever thought it up, their ideas are sweeping the education field just like the ideas of open air classrooms. We always follow something that someone else decides and make ourselves fit the mould. Ten years down the line we will have all sorts of curriculum set into twenty-five hour modules and people will decide that that really wasn't what they wanted and they'll revise the curriculum again. It's work for education people basically.

Donna also believed that the attempt to modularize the course into twenty-five hour time blocks may lead to other undesirable changes.

> What they will do is set it up in twenty-five hour modules and then the next step is to say well, then we can teach a four credit or a three credit, so in fact we are helping them towards an end that we do not think is necessarily good.
>
> We are wondering where...why the module thing is so important and where it's going and why it's being pushed. That's the only answer that we can come up with, that in fact they are pushing it because it will be more convenient for administrators to be able to cut down the program and say 'well, we can't fit a five credit program in here, we'll offer it as a three credit and you won't require as much funding and you can maybe teach law or German or whatever else.'
>
> There does not seem to be a viable argument for twenty-five hour modules in food science unless it is going to be an administrative tool and it is not necessarily going to improve our program from what we've seen to date.

Donna felt that although the piloting teachers continued to ask why the twenty-five hour module format was being adopted and if their input will alter the revision at all, they were given no answers.

> We've not been answered on either of those points and they have come up over and over again.
>
> The real problem is the twenty-five hours. We keep coming back to that but it is the problem we are not going to be able to change and so we are all having problems working with it.

> The questionnaires are a very sterile way of having people write down problems because no matter how the questions are phrased they are not phrased from the angle of the person who knows what's going on in the classroom. It's difficult to answer a questionnaire like that and still give real answers.

Donna could understand the resistance to change and believed that for good curriculum development the people who developed the revisions should also be piloting or at least sitting in on the discussions.

> If I created what I thought was a very good curriculum, I would be extremely resistant to change and if you are not sitting in and listening to all the problems that are happening, maybe you'll never find real reason to change because problems can be...little check marks on paper can be dismissed without....
>
> We hope our thing gets together with their thing eventually but we have no promise that we will be effective....
>
> I would like to get some background as to why they were set up into these particular groups and how they arranged that so many hours were to be spent on this, this and this, and where they put the emphasis because there must have been some in order to cover that amount of material in twenty-five hours. And so that's the kind of thing that we are missing, is some kind of justification for what they have done and how they sort of intended it to be done. We are sort of left without that and are doing all our own planning. We are having problems and if they weren't problems that were foreseen they can foresee them now for the rest of the province.
>
> You see I think the people who wrote the curriculum should be there and hearing the discussion all of the time and because they aren't, we sort of feel that discussing it among ourselves is fine, you can get a clearer idea of what exactly the problems are but where is it going to go from there? Are we going to be able to re-write it the way we feel it should be done?
>
> I think we will give our ideas and they will be right and we'll look at it again and say well, they haven't really solved the problems that we've seen because they weren't really working with it and so I simply will not be using that. I will do what I think should have come out of the curriculum and I'm sure that's going to happen with each of us and it's too bad.

However, Donna's experience was not all negative for she did feel she gained personally from participating in the piloting project.

> Whether or not we are effective in changing the curriculum, we have in fact done a lot of work already ourselves. Over the next three years we would have had to do that work anyway, no matter what kind of a curriculum came in.
>
> In the long run, when the dust settles, I will be teaching essentially the same thing. I will have a lot of new viewpoints that I can put into it and maybe from a different angle. I've already changed my nutrition unit almost completely....

For Donna, a revised curriculum was quite apart from what teachers did in their classrooms.

> The fact that the curriculum hasn't been revised in five years doesn't mean that the home economics teachers in the province aren't up-to-date. We have to be, we have to keep our students interested.
>
> In the classroom, the courses have been revised and revised according to the changing needs of the population around. We haven't been stagnant, we've been revising and revising.
>
> A curriculum is only a way of organizing information and stipulating what's important and what's important changes and home economics teachers change.

Would you participate in a pilot project again?

> I think so. It was an awful lot of work but it was work that I would have to do eventually when the curriculum comes on stream. Secondly, it was excellent opportunity to get to know teachers who were teaching in the same area from all over the province. That has been good.

My next conversation with Donna was following the final meeting of the piloting teachers, after the end of the semester. Our conversation centered on her reactions to the curriculum piloting process and her personal reactions as one of the piloting teachers.

One issue which was again discussed at the final meeting was why modules should be uniformly twenty-five hours. The response provided by one senior department of education official was that modules in fact need not be twenty-five hours. They are a guide to topics, the times allotted for which may deviate from twenty-five hours.

> I think that's the traditional cop-out.
>
> It's just...a defense mechanism for handling an obviously negative reaction.
>
> Why do we need a department of education to tell us that? Why do we need to organize a curriculum around twenty-five hour modules to end up saying 'well, do what you think is most important for most hours'.
>
> Given that he doesn't seem to really care about the twenty-five hour system no matter what else we've been told about how the department of education cares about the twenty-five hour module system, nobody is going to worry about it, so what's the point about all the fuss? It's foolishness.
>
> I have ultimately little or no faith in the upper hierarchy.

The process and expectations of the teachers participating in the project indicated the importance granted by the upper hierarchy and which for Donna became a negative opinion of the department of education.

> It seems that you are always expected to...the people who are going to have the most valuable input are supposed to do so with the least amount of dollars spent on it. Conversely the people who have the least input of all and will only rubber stamp it are the people that have the money at their disposal. But I guess that's similar to any other bureaucracy basically.
>
> The importance placed on home economics which could be a very, very important subject field, the importance and therefore the funding that is given to it is determined by a person or group of persons who have no idea of the concepts that are being discussed. They have a very bare bones concept of what's going on in home economics and yet they are making a large number of the decisions and in fact they are not taking the feedback from the people who are involved directly very seriously.
>
> When you call a section of your program life skills and you

> make it an elective...what student in the school does not require skills for living.
>
> I am disappointed with the reaction to our little group. Get them together and pat them on the head and say you are doing a good job, don't expect any more money, don't expect to ever see your ideas get anywhere really. We'll do what we can but we don't have much funds, we don't have much time for you but you are good people and we like to see women working hard and we know that you can do your thing on less funds because home economists are always such great managers that we don't need to give you anymore funds because you are such terrific managers and keep up the good job and gee, I have to go quickly before I have anymore questions that I can't answer.
>
> There were a number of tasks that they had to get done. They were not of great interest to all of us but they were required of them and so if we had more time perhaps more of the tasks that we would have liked to have seen get done would have got done, there would have been time for, but when you have requirements, the requirements of a pilot project are these and then what you get done other than that is great but essentially, you must have this, a, b, c, d, e, you must fill in the papers the right way and that's again bureaucracy, you know, they are not interested so much in what's produced but how it's produced and is it on the correct form.

Despite the chauvinist and bureaucratic attitudes which Donna experienced she did find positives in her experience, confirming again that it was a valuable and good experience for her.

> We (Donna and co-worker) went into it feeling that we had a pretty good program and we came out of it feeling that we had a darn good program and in fact we feel that we have one of the best programs in the province. That's a very definite pat on the back and that's not just an ego trip. Comparing your program to someone else's and seeing how it fills the needs of your students, it does a lot for your ego. I am a lot more positive about our program.
>
> It's good to find out that you're not too far out in left field.
>
> Everybody found it was just great to spend a day away from the classroom and work on curriculum materials with people who were as knowledgeable or more knowledgeable than yourself. It's just fantastic so that was a really good feeling.

It brought me into contact with a lot of really interesting people with a lot of different viewpoints. I will not say that in the long run it has changed my style of teaching in particular.

It's the kind of opportunity that I think it would be good to have every teacher in the province have from time to time, sort of an inservice that's valuable and leads somewhere.

4.2.3 Conversation and curriculum: A further retrospect

The teachers' perspective of curriculum is a situated as well as a personalized perspective. Curriculum, as the history indicates, is named within the administrators' interest. To consider how teachers may claim curriculum as their own requires exploration of the linkages between the private-personalized elements and those of their situation.

Teachers' lives in school structures are bureaucratically situated, and as described in the previous section, dominated by male/patriarchal values. This bureaucracy poses as a counterpoint to the ideology of the teaching profession based on nurturing, caring and individual opportunity and development. Within the concrete situation of the curriculum pilot project of this study, curriculum emerges as negotiated between the teacher and the curriculum administrator's view of curriculum.

Marilyn entered the curriculum pilot project believing that at least two of the courses she taught, modern living and clothing and textiles, needed revision. She hoped that by participating in the project, this needed revision would be stimulated, that she would also be able to contribute ideas to the project which would advance good curriculum and that she would gain professional recognition for her participation. As in beginning any course or new project, hopes were high for new possibilities, for some substantial developments in curriculum. There were hopes that some personal emerging ideas in curriculum could advance and that there would be time for dialogue with other teachers. Donna likewise entered the project hoping to be able to re-vitalize her teaching with new ideas or new approaches to teaching.

"I believe in a nice, clean, tight structured course...."

"I find the curriculum is a valuable tool...."

"We like to have a guide."

* * *

The guide is 'other'. A guide, a plan which frees me from me, which gives me over to you - guide.

"We like to have a guide."

I like to do according to my own thoughts, beliefs and wishes.

The students are gone. Quiet. I sit in my chair and the events of the day are alive in my mind. Separated, gone. What was the meaning of our together-ness today? Where are they now? What did they experience in the events of today? Exhausted, wondering.

I reach for the guide, the curriculum guide. I thumb through, reading lines, here and there - generalizations, objectives. Yes, yes. No. Activities.

I don't agree.

Okay, it fits the recommendations.

Deeply, I am uneasy, mixed, shaken, unsure.... I slump in my chair. Feelings, images, the summer winds...

Is that all there is?
Is that all there is?

> If that's all there is my friend, let's keep on dancing,
> let's bring out the booze and have a ball...
> If that's all there is...
>
> (Peggy Lee from "Is That All There Is?")

The refrain swells and drifts.

I close it. There it is on the desk.

I rail against the guide. Who wrote this? What was the intent? Whose ideas are these written then abandoned? Why are my answers not there? The spark that will light the enthusiasm, coallesce the thoughts that will capture the students tomorrow, reach out to them. We might run, fly with our ideas.

I reach out. Turn pages. Set it aside.

It isn't there.

As I set it aside, I am a little bit freed - disappointed, weary, but a little bit freed. I lean in my chair, survey the room, quiet, empty, but beneath the surface, bursting with action and energy.

Is that all there is?

* * *

> Both professions and bureaucracy belong to the same historical matrix: they consolidate in the early twentieth century as distinct but nevertheless complementary modes of work organization.
>
> (Larson, 1977, p. 199)

Magali Sarfatti Larson reminds us that the model of the profession emerged during the era of competitive capitalism, an expression of the ideal of the individual practitioner in a free market of services. While we cling to the original ideals, for professionals, particularly teachers today, life is as a salaried specialist in a large, bureaucratic organization. "Bureaucracy and professionalism are two sub-types of a larger category - that of rational administration" (Larson, 1977, p. 191). Larson claims that since the idea of the professional persists despite the altered societal-economic relations, it persists as an ideology which inspires collective and individual efforts and also mystifies and obscures the real social structures and relations of society.

Within the curriculum pilot project, the curriculum as document assumed a life of its own, beyond question. The teachers served it, as ultimate purpose. Both Marilyn and Donna experienced their participation as regulated and controlled, fragmented into performing a function within the bureaucratic structure and flow. Marilyn saw her participation as part of a "bureaucratic exercise" in which teachers were invited to enter one segment of the curriculum revision. She found within the project little acceptance of her as a complete teacher, little concern for her needs or interests in developing as a teacher. Marilyn's experience was what Beverly Cunningham described as being 'thinged' in the project. With curriculum taking on a life of its own, it poses, disembodied from the teacher, who is thingified in its service. Cunningham states that teachers are commonly 'thinged' in curriculum guides, projects and theory. "They are implicitly defined as identical filter systems through which knowledge passes unaffected by the filter itself" (1979, p.4). The bureaucratic approach to curriculum viewed the teacher as an 'it', a 'thing', a given constant whose being was denied in the project. Disembodied and thingified, the teacher experienced frustration and anger, differentiating herself from the educational bureaucrat, viewing the bureaucrat as 'not me'.

"I believe truly that no one up there is interested in what education is all about."

"It's work for education people basically."

"I have ultimately little or no faith in the upper hierarchy."

The teachers' own classroom ideals defined learning and desirable modes of relating with others. In the relationship between teachers and Alberta Education officials in the project, teachers desired an example of educational leadership.

Marilyn compared the educational approach expected of her as a teacher with the relationship approach she experienced in the project.

> It's like that in the teaching field. There are perfectly decent teachers around who allow a certain scope of thinking in their class, who achieve that scope of thinking...but that is not to say that there is not a wealth of knowledge that is still untapped and given your kids the opportunity to try and deal with that kind of thinking, that they couldn't achieve that as well.

Marilyn finds no recognition of her struggle to bring to realization thoughts and hopes about curriculum. At this experiential level, bureaucracy shows as bureaucratic, remote, manipulative, non-practical.

> If a curriculum model carries the hidden concept of teacher as implementor or facilitator or knowledge salesman, and ignores the significant factors that make him (sic) a human being, then this one-dimensional concept of teacher is just as dehumanizing and destructive as the narrow term 'learner' is to students.
>
> (Cunningham, 1979, p.6)

The curriculum pilot project for Marilyn, rather than becoming an opener of possibility, closed off, contained and isolated her. She came to feel alone, the communication, the support network she hoped for was broken. It was her problem that she could not open discussion, lead ideas in new directions. While she felt she had lots to offer in curriculum, the unwillingness to consider openings left her doubting herself and her abilities to work with others. She withdrew her energies from the project.

"Forget it you guys. I will do as I please and accomplish as I please."

> Individualism appears to be a central ideological process which runs across the whole social structure.... Its essential effect is to produce the 'subjective illusion' by which the individual believes he (sic) acts as a free agent in identifying with the political and ideological structures of his society. Because actions, meanings and words appear to emanate solely from his subjectivity, the individual cannot grasp the shaping of his self by ideology, nor the relations between his free actions and thoughts and the social structure within which he is inserted. The subjective illusion which can be seen as a characteristic effect of all ideology is magnified by bourgeois individualism. Because every person can be convinced that he or she is a free and responsible agent, endowed with equal rights, individualism appears as a crucial mechanism by which the ideology of the ruling class becomes dominant - that is, shared alike by the rulers and the ruled and invested with the appearance of universality.
>
> (Larson, 1977, p. 224)

As Larson points out, the belief in the free individual is one of the central ideological elements in our present capitalist and social milieu and one of the central beliefs of professionals. The reinforcement of this ideological element is negotiated in the curriculum relationship between the teachers and bureaucrats.

For Marilyn, the process further confirmed her own individuality, she was not a "home ecer". She felt separated, distrustful and unlike the others. She saw herself as a leader, as a critical thinker, however, her inability to open communication on this level led her to see the other teachers as not like her.

An alternate dimension of this individualism, is the experience of self-affirmation. Both Donna and Marilyn found within the project a source of self-affirmation.

> I think it's perfectly reasonable. Like how much do we change.... I guess it's self-preservation when you reinforce what you believe in.

> We went into it (the project) feeling that we had a pretty good program and we came out of it feeling that we had a darn good program and in fact we feel we have one of the best programs in the province.

At this point the relationship between teacher and bureaucrat, centering on curriculum appeared almost as a ritual. They come together, focused on curriculum, interact, negotiate and each separate, re-confirming their identities. The teachers re-confirm their professional ideology in their anti-bureaucratic stance. They (the other, the bureaucrat) doesn't understand, doesn't care.

> Science has created a world in which human beings first manipulate nature (technology) and in order to do so, manipulate other human beings (bureaucracy). In contrast to the world of community and society, what matters in the new world is whether such manipulation works not whether it is approved by others.
>
> (Hummel, 1977, p. 187)

The teachers return to their classroom feeling good about what they are doing and will continue to do what they think best. The administrators proceed with their plan, lavishing praise on the co-operating teachers while continuing to administer the details of the project. The fault for poor curriculum will be with individual deviant teachers who are non-professional, rigid, etc., necessitating more checks, inspections, inservices, evaluations, etc.

4.3 SUMMARY

In the attempt to explore the teachers' perspective of curriculum, this chapter has included segments of the teachers' conversations and interpretative or sense-making reflections on these conversations. Simply stated, the questions pursued have been: How and what do teachers decide to teach each day? This exploration of curriculum defined as the teachers' perspective is a focus on curriculum-in-action, a conceptual nexus of meaning of the teacher-participants in the study.

The teachers' perspective of curriculum can be described as both personal and situated. The personal dimension is constituted by a personal/private dimension which links with the family of origin and of present configuration and connects with our societal position in terms of class and gender. A further personal dimension can be described as personal/professional, which connects the individual to the system of professional beliefs and the altering intersection of these over time. The personal dimension is grounded in the beliefs, values and ideals of the individual teacher. It is constituted by the dynamic relationship between teacher, students and subject matter. A relationship which alters and guides both teachers and students, as it is altered and guided. Curriculum as relationship is a medium in which is sought transcendence, the essence of being human. Transcendence as the constant struggle to know , to understand, is the desirable element, which is transacted in the constant dialectic between self and other in relationship. Relationship in curriculum is further grounded in the teacher's knowing of her self as knower. Her awareness of herself as knower, the way she knows and enjoys learning is the ground on which she constructs learning for students. Through knowing herself, she comes to know more of her students and of herself.

The personal dimension speaks also of who we are as individuals beyond the school situation. The personal becomes public, public becomes personal. The distinction breaks down. How we see ourselves in relation to society and the possibilities we see for ourselves is the ground on which transcendence is sought. In this dimension curriculum is grounded in gender and class and our consciousness of the intersections of gender and class with all other levels of our being and knowing. This further connects to our professional belief system and the extent to which its ideology grounds the personal beliefs and ideals of teaching.

As situated, the teachers' perspective of curriculum is a reactive stance. That is, it is a perspective formulated in a situation defined by the 'other' - curriculum as named by administrators. Curriculum as situated connects to other factors within the school system itself - relationship to other courses, school expectations and climate, student expectations. Beyond the school situation, curriculum derives from the negotiated relationship between teacher and the educational bureaucrats who define and act in terms of curriculum. Curriculum thus is a dynamic perspective which connects the personal dimension and its multi-facets with the multi-faceted situational dimension all of which relate and change over time.

This exploration of curriculum reveals no definitive or easy answers. It rather reveals the dilemmas and intricacies of curriculum, the many threads which go off in all directions. It moves curriculum beyond the traditional understanding in terms of instrumental or technical action (objectives, generalizations, concepts) to an understanding in personal meaning and political dimensions.

Michael Apple states that to search for understanding in the fullest possible sense means "to pass from the psychological to the social, and from the social to the politico-economic and then dialectically 'back' to the individual" (Apple, 1978, p. 519).

The intent of the study has been to open and expand an understanding of curriculum rather than to reduce and isolate. It is an effort in accord with Philip Phenix's idea of extension:

> Any entity is constituted by the set of relationships that it has with all other entities. Thus nothing exists in isolation, but always in relation. Reality is a single interconnected whole, such that the complete description of any entity would require the comprehension of every other entity.
>
> (Phenix, 1975, p. 326)

Curriculum in the personal perspective of the teacher, opens and goes beyond, what it seems at first. It is a nexus of relationships which we can only understand by pursuing the various threads of relationship. However, our understanding is never complete. It is always limited by our own limitations to grasp the wholeness, but it forever awaits.

David Denton also speaks of the limitations we encounter in bringing experience and meaning to words:

> The language of teaching is similar to the language of love, in that it is about an experience so holistic, so

> immediate and so close to us that we can't say what it is.
>
> (Denton, 1974, p. 107)

Thus, as much as we can open, to bring to words the unsaids, the taken-for-granteds, and the silences, we can never say it all. Experience and meaning await for it cannot all be said.

In the following chapter, the teachers' perspective of curriculum will be connected to the current theories of curriculum and considered in terms of action: What does it mean for teachers to claim curriculum as their own?

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

The purpose of this study has been to explore the teachers' perspective of curriculum and the influences on this perspective. It arose from concerns about the theory/practice relationship, concerns that particular curriculum theorizing approaches, purporting to be aligned with the teachers' interest, would remain only as theory unless we were more familiar with concrete dimensions in daily situations for teachers. The intent of this study was to explore and to open to discourse the teachers' perspective of curriculum such that we might come to know more clearly what this perspective is.

The conversations with the teachers in this study point to the limitations of our traditional mode of curriculum thought and action concerned with objectives, generalizations, concepts, etc. The mode in which our curriculum documents are written and the belief underlying this action holds that consensus is desirable and possible and that action can be separated from thought. Teachers, however, are here revealed as thinking and acting subjects, thought and action being two sides of the same coin. Action is based on thought. Our daily action in the classroom (curriculum) is connected to a network of beliefs grounded in our understanding of our own being and knowing. The teachers' perspective of curriculum is based in the relationship of teacher to student and to subject matter. The essential aspect of this relationship is the intermingling and coming to form of student, teacher and subject matter, each a part of the other.

Curriculum in this personalized perspective is embodied in the teacher. This embodiment, however, incorporates not only professional (classroom) action but also the personal/private consciousness, gender and class identified, a lived orientation in the world. In this embodiment, the personal and public/professional dimensions are one. Curriculum for the female teachers in this study was action negotiated in relationship to their personal/family commitments. The resolution of the conflicting and contradictory commitments to both family and profession was also a part of curriculum, a factor in what was done each day in the classroom. Finally curriculum was shown as situation, defined and determined by 'other', and negotiated in relationship to the bureaucratic-administrators' perspective. The 'other' perspective, however, as situation also shapes consciousness and must be claimed psychically and structurally if our curriculum orientation is to be altered.

Curriculum as action of teachers with students can be understood wholistically only as it moves beyond the traditional/instrumental mode. To understand and to improve curriculum action we must account for the personal and political dimensions of the action.

Structures and situations do not only exist out there. While we can claim they exist 'out there', structures and situations are also representative of, imprint upon, and form our consciousness. It is at this point that the personal is political, an expression which has taken on substantial meaning in feminist theory. Feminist theory reminds us that personal/social arrangements are a base of the political/public arrangements. Women and other oppressed groups maintain the 'polis' and thus occupy a position of potential transformation on a broader social scale.

> The democracy of the Athenian polis, to which the Western world has always looked as its ideal, was made possible only through the restricted domestic labours of the slaves and wives of the Athenian property owners. Western freedom and affluence depend on the domestication of women and the exploitation of a low-paid labour base made up of minorities and women as well as unlimited access to foreign sources of natural resources which are taken from the ground without regard for the rights of the Earth or the people who live on the land.
> (Collins, 1982, p. 363)

The 'polis' or political ideals on which our present society is arranged is based on the idea of division - men from women, theory from practice, - dualities which plague our social and intellectual lives today.

> Male/female, mind/body, subject/object, man/nature, inner/outer, white/black, rational/irrational, civilized/primitive...the left hand side of each equation has assumed a kind of right of ownership over the right. The relationship is one of owner to owned, oppressor to oppressed rather than one of mutuality.
> (Collins, 1982, p. 364)

To claim curriculum will thus mean to claim wholeness, thought and action, mind and body, inner and outer, self and 'other'. For teachers, claiming curriculum as situation requires a claiming not only the part that is me, but also the part that is 'not me'.

The teachers' perspective of curiculum poses as a subjective, alternate position to the administrators' perspective described as instrumental and technical. To claim an alternate perspective can also maintain dualities and divisiveness, leading to no constructive or progressive actions. In the dynamic of the relationship with 'other', we need also to risk in claiming our creation of the relationship. Central to our thinking is the dialectic flow, a dialectic which can turn positive and liberational or negative and divisive. Susan Griffin (1982) speaks of the 'intent' behind our dialogue as what matters above all. She warns of losing self through denial and projection.

> I can be angry. I can hate. I can rage. But the moment I have defined another being as my enemy, I lose part of myself, the complexity and subtlety of my vision. I begin to exist in a closed system. When anything goes wrong, I blame my enemy. Slowly all the power in my life begins to be located outside, and my whole being is defined in relation to this outside force, which becomes daily more monstrous, more evil, more laden with all the qualities in myself I no longer wish to own. The quality of my thought then is diminished. My imagination grows small. My self seems meager. For my enemy has stolen all these.
> (Griffin, 1982, p. 7)

In conversation, Marilyn articulated the sense of internalized resistance to which Susan Griffin refers, a resistance not against the 'other' but a resistance deeply internal - the 'other' in me. Marilyn had well thought out her educational beliefs about experiential education particularly, however, she did not always, nor even often enough act upon them. It bothered her that she did not, could not, do more. Her ideals she saw as "blue-sky dreaming" and her reflection on her actions as "an exercise in feeling inadequate". A form of counter-resistance operates within each being that clings to security and old patterns which is enhanced by resistance on the concrete level. Curriculum development and personal transformation will come through altering the concrete, structural limitations, personal consciousness and the spiritual will which unites both levels.

> The journey into self has no known end, but once you have been faithful to it for a while you are sustained in your efforts at social action by your whole being which refuses

> to shrink to fit the mechanical structures of rundown and senile institutions. This refusal is no longer a negation but a joyful affirmation, a "Here I stand and can do no other". Then social action, the creation of culture, is no longer intellectual analyses and preaching. It is the language of our total body, a new poetic wisdom emerging out of a continuous integration of rational and non-rational rather than a projection coming out of fear.
>
> (Littleford, 1981, p. 215)

Curriculum development will occur as dualities are overcome, when teachers can claim themselves as both thinkers and doers, when a profound sense of human mutuality can enter relationships between students and teachers, teachers and curriculum workers.

Overcoming the structural maintenance of these dualities is a curriculum concern. Curriculum development will progress as individual teachers develop their own personal consciousness of themselves and their relationship to society, to the elements which maintain oppression and are produced and reproduced in school settings in male/female, teacher/administrator and student/teacher relationships.

Dynamic and inspired curriculum requires dynamic and inspired teachers whose lives are authentic, autonomous and committed.

Madeleine Grumet states:

> We have burdened the teaching profession with contradictions and betrayals that have alienated teachers from their own experiences, from their bodies, their memories, their dreams, from each other, from children, and from their sisters who are mothers to those children.
>
> Alienated from self and helpless to change their own class status through their work, female teachers may be the least equipped persons in our society to bridge the distance between achievement and social status.
>
> (Grumet, 1981, p.182)

The current feminist movement is individually transforming women's lives, family roles are changing and the heightened consciousness of female teachers offers a powerful potential for transforming curriculum. Challenged to aid students in the transcendence of the present situation, female teachers have increasingly their own experiential base in a liberational process on which to draw. At the same time this potential reinforces the importance of gender awareness in education, of encouraging teachers' awareness of their own oppression.

> Those who participate in this process of liberating the individual cannot do so unless they themselves are also 'in process'.
>
> (Mitrano, 1981, p. 63)

The conversations with teachers in this study pointed to the centrality of gender in their lives and the struggles they were having in living their lives with some sense of autonomy. For both Marilyn and Donna, the double commitments to their career and family were central. Their marriages and children combined with the social expectation of the home and family as women's sphere of responsibility, doubly burdened them with demands on their physical and emotional energies. These double demands in both incidences resulted in their seeking their major satisfaction within their families. The commitments to careers were limited. Marilyn for the time being, ceased applying for other positions within the education system. Donna was considering teaching parttime, possibly having children, and stated that school would receive less and less of her.

Michael Apple (1982) described teachers' oppression as a process of 'proletarianization', two aspects of which are the increase in teacher-proof materials and general intensification in the work place. The centralized planning and control of curriculum, separating conceptualization from action in curriculum has led to an interest in teacher-proof materials. Units are packaged, complete with step-by-step instructions so that any teacher can use them. This is an extreme example of thought separated from action. The second effect of proletarianization is intensification. Once the teacher is de-skilled, she relies on outside experts to guide her daily actions, partly through reliance on teacher-proof materials. This requires a constant need to re-learn skills and the time to 'keep up' in the field. Donna described the experience of intensification in the hours and hours of time spent in evaluating, completing forms and administrative tasks which was not time devoted to the more enjoyable aspects of teaching, all contributing to her 'professional burn-out'. Proletarianization of teaching results in teachers having less and less control over their own labour.

Apple (1982) claims the class location of teachers is a contradictory position simultaneously between management and labour, the petit bourgeois and the working class. That is, teachers' labour involves aspects of both management and working class labour. Women, prevented by family commitments, are less likely to aspire to the petit bourgeois positions in education and are thus more commonly identified as proletariat in the educational system.

The general experience of intensification in teaching and the conflicting commitments to career and family for female teachers creates a general intensification in their life with the result that less energy and time is left for interaction with other teachers in the school, informally, socially, and in professional organizations and activities. The result is an isolation of individual teachers and the affirming of the individualistic professional ideology.

While the situation of the teachers in this study can be described as oppressive along these various dimensions, there were also elements of resistance to these oppressive aspects and certain incidences and attempts to penetrate the oppressiveness and take control of the situation directly. The central nature of the relationship between the teachers and the Alberta Education officials was resistance. The teachers resisted the domination by the officials in the project, turning the resistance into an affirmation of themselves and their view of and action in curriculum. The resistance had the effect of maintaining a separation between teachers and administrators, and theory and practice, which resulted in the reproduction of the social and intellectual arrangements.

However, within the resistances there were penetrations, openings which can lead to the teacher asserting her perspective of curriculum. The contact with other teachers which the curriculum project provided was an opening to collective action which both Donna and Marilyn found valuable.

> Dissatisfaction with the structural limitations of one's work and the social uses of one's productive activity need not remain a private crises of conscience. The passage from purely personal problems to a collective evaluation of their causes begins to merge the personal and political.
>
> (Larson, 1977, p. 243)

The interaction of the teachers in the project was an experience in countering the isolation and individualism of daily teaching. Beyond the participation in the pilot project, Marilyn became involved in the informal curriculum pilot project. With no fixed agenda nor vested interests, it provided a means for teachers to conduct a "collective evaluation" of their concerns with curriculum in clothing and textiles and a penetration of the dominant mode of curriculum action.

> The smallest discrete unit which acts as the basis for cultural penetration is the informal group.
> (Willis, 1977, p. 123)

The dialogue, the "working through things", and collaboration which the informal pilot project provided resulted in Marilyn's developing an experimental course which she taught the following year.

A closer speculation on the resistances and partial penetrations which the teachers show can suggest ways in which we may enhance curriculum transformation.

It is within the oppressive elements of the situation, creating intense contradictions within individuals, that progressive elements are contained. The teachers' being female contain these simultaneously oppressive and potentially powerful elements. Women are loosely identified with their career. As the proletariat of the teaching profession, they are freer to be critical and challenging of it. Women's expectations of career are opposed to those of men, who as aspiring petit bourgeois are less likely to challenge the status quo.

> The expectation of career is a powerful factor of conformity with the existing social order and a source of basic conservatism.
> (Larson, 1977, p. 229)

Women are currently situated at a time in which their identity may be based primarily in the family and yet, remaining in the teaching profession they are seeking an affirmation of the female experience in education and attempting to penetrate domination on this level itself. The feminist movement has offered women a social reflection of themselves contrary to the dominant ideology and a self-affirmation as female. Women now are more willing to challenge their own domination in families, in society and in schools.

The idea of curriculum as embodied points to the importance of gender in understanding educational action and experience. Gender is as Michael Apple (1982) states, the "absent presence" behind our work in education. Historically, education has been a masculine venture. Since the schools of the ancient Greeks, and later in the military, seminaries, and universities, education was intended to prepare young males for participation in the public world. Since women's future would not be in the public sphere, education was not an issue. Only in the past two centuries have women in Western societies begun to demand equal educational opportunities within the public sphere. However, women have entered and lived in educational institutions within male structures dominated by male values.

Adrienne Rich (1979) states that the content of education validates men as it invalidates women. The messages of education are that men have been the shapers and thinkers of the world and that this is only natural. As well, the experience for women in the educational structures has been an experience of being prey, not an autonomous being.

> The undermining of self, of a woman's sense of her right to occupy space and walk freely in the world, is deeply relevant to education. The capacity to think independently, to take intellectual risks, to assert ourselves mentally, is inseparable from our physical way of

> being in the world, our feelings of personal integrity.
> (Rich, 1979, p. 242)

Dynamic, independent and adventuresome curriculum is not likely to spring from bodies, devalued and confined by society.

> If for men (sic) to be in the world of work is to be totally dependent, insecure, and permanently threatened - if their work does not belong to them - men cannot be fulfilled. Work which is not free ceases to be a fulfilling pursuit and becomes an effective means of dehumanization.
> (Freire, 1970, p. 141)

Claiming curriculum for women and men requires a gender conscientization, a critique of the ideology which surrounds our bodies for our bodies are inseparable from our minds.

Curriculum writers have recently begun to link feminist and curriculum theory (Mitrano, 1981; Grumet, 1981). Of urgent necessity is an increased exploration of the male experience in education, the sort of which has begun in a recent essay by William Pinar (1983).

> We are two inside each one of us. It is because we are double that struggle is possible. I cannot liberate my sex without yours, since we are inextricably linked by a history that has objectified our bodies, a history of fragmenting ideologies.
> (Gagnon, 1982, p. 273)

Feminism as a social movement is altering substantively and conceptually women's lives. Women are recovering their voice to speak their experience and alter their situation. As such, feminism represents a powerful impulse with potential for transforming the social relationships within schools and thus curriculum.

Women are spending less time devoted exclusively to their families and more time in their careers. Confined to the lower levels in the education system, yet well educated and experienced, they are demanding and developing autonomy within the situation. As an indication is Marilyn's commitment to teaching and her curriculum development work in designing and teaching experimental courses.

Feminism, centered on transforming female/male relationships is transforming the substance of home economics. Donna believed that the women's movement had a tremendous impact during the past decade in altering the self-image of home economics teachers and our belief that home economics was a course of equal value to both males and females. With a new self-image, home economics teachers confront the subject area, asking: What will it let me be? With new personal knowledge, old concepts are transformed.

Michael Apple describes this interaction as a:

> Progressive element within the content of the material that contradicts the messages of the form. And it is in the interaction between content, the form, and the lived culture of the people involved that contradictory outcomes may emerge.
>
> (Apple, 1980, p. 23)

Feminist theory on the family has advanced analysis historically, and politically. Home economics is led beyond the surface chatter of textiles, meats and management, beyond the taken-for-granteds of women's role in the family and society to situate a grounding in the perennial human problems of the relationship of the individual to society, the private to the public spheres of existence. This is the kind of focus which is akin to Marjorie Brown's description of the purpose of home economics in solving problems "of the family as a family".

> Problems of the family as a family are concerned with suffering brought about by the family's inability to engage adequately in areas of action which defined its role as a primary social institution. These areas of action include:

> (1)action in rational-purposive production or procurement of the physical entities required by the family for the good life, (2) communicative action within the family and with social groups outside the family for understanding and for consensus in defining the good life, that is, in the formation and determination of values and goals, and (3) emancipative action in freeing individuals, the family, and society from dogmatic beliefs and from social forces which are dominative or exploitative.
>
> (Brown, 1980, p. 101)

> Home economics education, therefore must provide service which seeks a broad social consciousness and critical awareness of conditions in society that historically damage the family's ability to act in the interest of human happiness.
>
> (Brown, 1980, p. 101-102)

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

Now, a turn back to the current discourse in the curriculum field to consider the implications which this exploratory study poses. In the earlier section, an overview was provided of the conceptual frames for curriculum theorizing of Giroux, Penna and Pinar (1981) and Aoki (1979). It was claimed that this study was situated within the reconceptual orientation to curriculum, in focusing on personal experience and ideological critique.

A central concern which has emerged in the curriculum field is the extent to which reconceptual theorizing has been confined to a reactive stance. A stance which lapses into the problem of all ideology - 'They are not like me' (Griffin, 1982). It is a reactive stance which based either on personal or critical dimensions, aspires to the dominant position and the power encompassed in that position. The oppressed aspire to the position of the oppressor and employ tactics to render power. Critical theory poses to know what is best for the majority of people and proposes agenda for securing this better state. It takes on the instrumental, technical attitudes of scientific management.

Karen Mazza criticized the reconceptual theorists for failing to:

> Establish a reconceptualized view of design that sheds the consequences of instrumental valuing but retains the capacity to act; that allows curricularists to surpass the stage of using those values in the creation of alternative educational environments.
>
> To date, reconceptual theorists have failed to seize the radical implication of their observation that conceptual tools and structures mediate consciousness - the implication being that beyond the use of criticism, they must fight the domination of the technological perspective by the development and diffusion of alternative conceptual

> tools, structures, and social relationships, ones that mediate different perspectives.
>
> (Mazza, 1982, p. 75)

While Karen Mazza's criticism seems at times to be calling for reconceptual theorizing to be more prescriptive, she is pointing, I believe, to the need to be more than reactive, to begin through language, process and structural changes to move to concrete alternatives.

James Macdonald queries the intent behind curriculum theorizing, reminding us that whether we pursue curriculum in "the clothes of science or critical theory or technique" (1982, p. 55), the intent is a rationalism which retains the dualism of theory and practice. As long as we retain the idea that we know what is best for someone else: men for women, women for men, administrators for teachers, teachers for students, domination and oppression is the experience for the other. This intent touches on a deeper level than Jurgen Habermas' tri-paradigmatic scheme of knowledge suggests. His scheme implies that we can employ any one or all three ways of knowing: technical, interpretative, or critical. However, it appears rather that the interpretative way of knowing, grounded in the personal and embodied consciousness, penetrates the restrictions of the rationalist intent of the technical and critical knowing.

Coming to terms with one's intent, is coming to terms with one's need to know.

> The emotions that govern the need to be rational or 'objective' (analyze, distinguish and categorize) are anxiety, fear and tension.
>
> (Macdonald, 1982, p. 55)

Aoki stated:

> I find it important to centre curriculum thought on a broader frame, that of 'man (sic)/world relationships' for it permits probing of the deeper meaning of what it is for persons (teachers and students) to be human, to become more human, and to act humanly in educational situations.
>
> (Aoki, 1974, p. 4)

The people/world relationship is viewed in terms of action - work, communication, and reflection and three forms of knowledge: nomological, situational interpretative and critical, each indicative of our need to know, our need to understand. These three forms of knowledge, however, are based on a need to know which also needs to be critically examined. Each still reflects three ways of linking the individual to society. The intent behind Habermas' scheme appears as a need to dominate, to really know. While the intent for domination lingers, we will not be free. Our liberation awaits a major transformation in our world view which values difference, harmony, and liberation for all.

Curriculum can only enhance and affirm life and world when the rationalist, domination intents are pushed further and further back, when we can confront each other whole, unmasked and alive, when we can dance, love, laugh and learn. My commitment to the ideals of feminism and the desire for whole and harmonious lives, leads to rejecting any dominating intent as being progressive and desirable.

The idea of hermeneutics as an interpretative way of knowing, emerged rather in this study as a possible ontological base. Both theory and practice are moments in the search for understanding, a seeking of wholeness and groundedness. Both empirical science and critical theory pose questions which break through our previous knowing, our previous illusions in the pursuit of understanding.

> The three methods (science, critical theory and poetics) are contributory methodologies to a larger hermeneutic circle of continual search for greater understanding, and for more satisfying interpretation of what is.
> (Macdonald, 1982, p. 57)

Science, critical theory and hermeneutics all proceed by a theory-practice relationship, claimed Macdonald.

> The hermeneutic circle of understanding lies within each of the epistemologies and also transcends each method in the form of an ontological platform.
> (Macdonald, 1982, p. 57)

This re-search originated in the conversations, the talk which sprang from the interest and focus on curriculum. The themes which recurred and persisted shaped the interpretative frame. The conversations were the occasion to recall experiences and impressions of my own teaching. They were the occasion which called forth the re-entering and re-living in the search for understanding. Simultaneously, the conversations urged beyond to pursue understanding. The dissertation attempted through its writing to show the interpretative interplay between the re-living and the re-searching. The interpretation has been a dialectical process, calling on the experience and on the theoretical of curriculum, psychology, sociology, philosophy, playing each against the other in probing beyond the surface reality to a fullness and critical insight. Paul Ricoeur described explanation and understanding as "relative moments in a complex process called interpretation" (Reagan & Stewart, 1978, p. 150), with explanation moving to understanding as experience is brought forward, shaped and enriched by explanation, and understanding moving to explanation as experience and dialogue are queried.

> Understanding is rather the non-methodic moment which, in the sciences of interpretation, comes together with the methodic moment of explanation. Understanding precedes, accompanies, closes and thus envelops explanation. In return, explanation develops understanding analytically.
> (Reagan & Stewart, 1978, p. 165)

The interpretative sense-making portion of this study has attempted to portray the movement between explanation and understanding , idea and experience. It has attempted to show the distanciation of the objectifying moment as well as the engagement of the lived moment. It has critically questioned the appropriateness of each in the interest of just and emancipatory social relationships.

Bringing together thought and feeling in a relationship of openness and trust with others, the result of our interaction, our curriculum emerges, transcending both other and self. Self comes to realization, caught in the moment, made sense of in reflection. The poetic melds with the political, without fear. The hermeneutic (as embodied) breaks through to a fundamentally different way of seeing the world. Both science and critical theory are important moments in the broader hermeneutic.

I am led further to question why this desire for domination is the enduring intent behind our thinking. How have we come to live this existence, separated from ourselves? Carolyn Merchant situates the major transformation in our relationship to our world approximately in the fifteenth century, with the transformation from an organismic to a mechanistic world view. In the organismic view, we were a part of our world which was alive, balanced, harmonious.

We were part of nature, all was alive about us. Not an unfamiliar view, for it is the original, child's view of the world. Gradually through advancing modes of science, religion and all cultural forms, Merchant proposes we, as people, have shifted our view to a mechanistic mode separating ourselves from and seeking to control nature. 'Not like me'. Merchant views this transformed world view as a major detriment to women, for women came to be viewed as 'natural' creatures who were also to be controlled.

> It was man who represented the subject of creation, while woman was a distinctly subhuman object. She was irrational nature, rampant sexuality, the primitive dark, bestial side of life, while man represented the light, civilizing, rational superego. Salvation was located in an other worldly return to the spiritual essence and in a repudiation of nature and the body.
>
> (Collins, 1982, p. 365)

We can glean from Carolyn Merchant's analysis how we have come to be where we are socially, however, we cannot secure our future based on ideas of the past.

Marilyn Ferguson (1980) provides a recent hope for a currently emerging, major transformation in world view. She claims our social thought is lagging behind the emerging scientific thought. The new transformation is emerging in the coalescing of numerous 'movements', renewed spirituality, peace, ecology and feminism. From Ferguson and similar scenarios portrayed by Alvin Toffler (1980) and Fritjof Capra (1982), we hold visions of the future. However, we must return to the moment and consider the implications for concrete action which this exploration of curriculum imply.

While we project ourselves into a future larger and longer than our own, in daily action, we inch toward the vision. It is hoped that this study in portraying the teachers' conversations about curriculum presents a story into which other teachers may enter. The situations in which teachers work rarely provide an opportunity for sharing on the deeper level thoughts about curriculum and daily teaching. In having other teachers tell their own story and in the retrospective, sense-making segments, it is hoped that the reader may enter the dialogue on curriculum, strike a resonance with the words and experiences of the teachers, opening new awarenesses of curriculum -in-action.

> This clarification and dredging up of our own values and belief system is an ongoing process, but must be brought to consciousness and made deliberate. Until we know a particular value we hold, it holds us - we are not in possession of it; it affects our work and thinking although we are unaware of it.
>
> (McCutcheon, 1982, p. 21)

The exploration of the teachers' perspective points to the need to reconceptualize and reformulate curriculum development according to this perspective. Curriculum is portrayed as the medium and process of relationship with students and subject matter and as situationally influenced by factors of gender, class, school setting and others perspectives of curriculum. Curriculum development requires focusing with teachers on these various dimensions, in a questioning, critical action.

Curriculum development projects need to recognize that rich and vital curriculum stems from teachers enabled to live rich and vital lives. Teachers, like students, are developing people, both professionally and personally and require personal and structural support and encouragement in their developmental process. Curriculum cannot be centrally controlled and simultaneously be responsive and meaningful to the varied students and teachers concerned. Rather teachers must be enabled to respond to locational and personal variations, commanding curriculum as the medium for development of both students and teachers. This does not mean that chaos reigns but that teachers are enabled to develop and enact curricular projects.

For curriculum workers working with teachers, the relationship is educational, with elements similar to the relationship between teachers and students. Teachers wish to experience the relationship in educational terms, to experience the ideas (theory) which curriculum leaders espouse. The relationship desired is not of directiveness but of trust, openness, communication and joint discovery.

Curriculum in the teachers' perspective is essentially a story, reflecting the person and the situation. Both Marilyn and Donna indicate the development which can occur when teachers have the opportunity to share their stories, to talk and learn from each other. Development can occur in a situation, loosely structured, and tuned to the process and experience of those involved. Parallels are evident between the teachers' relationship to curriculum and women's relationship in society. Both teachers and women live and work in situations not of their own determination. Feminist theory claims that both schools and families are controlled situations, patriarchal institutions in which women are cast in a position of maintaining the structure and control imposed upon them. The feminist model of the consciousness-raising group or the conscientization process proposed by Paulo Freire (1970) are examples of an alternate desirable relationship between teachers and curriculum developers. Claiming curriculum as a teacher parallels the claiming of ones self as female. Elements of these processes were evident in Marilyn's experience with the informal pilot group: no vested interests or task-limited agenda, open and trusting dialogue, an opportunity to advance feelings and thought, to name a problem and then consider alternatives. Marilyn's experience was positive and encouraging of imagination and initiative.

Curriculum development processes need to provide the opportunity on a continuous basis for teachers in small localized groups to reflect upon and critique their classroom actions in a continuous developmental process. Curriculum development necessitates an encouraging and letting the person emerge, a recognizing of the adult teacher as a growing, emerging, learning and changing individual. Incentive and encouragement is needed to overcome the structural limitations to communication and communal action in teaching.

An altered process of curriculum development places altered demands on curriculum leaders working with teachers. The work would demand a trust and vulnerability, an openness to also being a learner. Liz Stanley and Sue Wise (1983) remind us of the tendency to hide behind structures. "Institutions, structures, do not oppress. People oppress people - they make decisions to do so, and the oppressed sometimes comply in acts of oppression", (Stanley & Wise, 1983, p. 82).

For teacher educators and curriculum workers, the teachers' perspective of curriculum urges us to develop curriculum awareness through examination of biography, in terms of education, home economics, gender and class. The process of currere provides a model for developing this subjective awareness (Pinar, 1975). The process of biography points to the needed attention to history, not only personal but also cultural, along the same dimensions. Present understandings and possibilities for future actions can only be derived with a keen awareness of the history of women, education and home economics. Personal biography is the counterpart of cultural history, one can only be understood in relation to the other.

The process of currere develops curriculum as the relationship between the knower and the known, a dynamic process caught in the moment and open to continual transformation. Currere encourages a process described by Lawrence Stenhouse as discovery or inquiry based teaching.

> A strategy which invites the teacher to cast himself (sic) in the role of a learner in his work so that his life in his classroom extends rather than constricts his intellectual horizons. A good classroom...is one in which things are learned everyday which the teacher did not previously know.
>
> (Stenhouse, 1975, p. 37)

> Learning is finding out what you already know.
> Doing is demonstrating that you know it.
> Teaching is reminding others that they know just as well as you.
> You are all learners, doers, teachers.
>
> (Bach, 1977, p. 58)

Discovery or inquiry based teaching casts the teacher and student in a subject/subject relationship, a praxis in which the emergent is liberational for both teacher and student, curriculum worker and teacher.

Finally the exploration of curriculum has continually pointed to the centralness of human caring in education. Curriculum development will arise with the opportunity for dialogue, trust, openness and life enhancing activities of creativeness, adventure and joy.

From this exploration of home economics curriculum, substantive questions about home economics emerge. The historical study of home economics curriculum indicated that in the schools, home economics has served to socialize females according to the social ideology about women prevalent in the various decades. Thus curriculum accumulated the various views of women within the domestic sphere: as moral upholders of society, consumer experts, home managers, nurturers and care-givers, and has developed around these female role tasks. As well, home economics gained popularity as an education for girls and has been unable to alter its identification as a female subject area. Confined by the ideology of women in society it is de-valued in schools as a course for females, as females and their work in families are de-valued in society. Teachers of home economics searching within the subject matter for 'what will it let me be?', find few openings for transcendence. Home economics is challenged to question its substantive focus in the minutiae of the female role and rather to turn to a focus on central human problems of relationships and families in which the ideology of women becomes a central problem in itself.

Homes and families are divergent and emerging within individuals and generations. Home economics as a family focused program demands a central emphasis on communicative and interpretative, as well as emancipatory knowledge forms. This means a recognition of the limitations of traditional social science theory as the central knowledge base. The essence of home economics is its cultural interest and therefore the emphasis on knowledge forms which are emancipatory and communicative are required if it is not to serve a reification of past social forms and relations. Families are, like curriculum, a relationship through which we seek to bring ourselves to form, a relationship through which we seek meaning and inspiration as the knowledge foundation for families of the future.

From this study, future directions for research are suggested. Gender was portrayed as a central dynamic. The relationship between gender and curriculum, the history of women teachers in schools, longitudinal studies relating curriculum to teaching career, and the experience for women (with children of their own) of teaching other people's children, are all research focuses which can enlarge our understandings of the gender dynamic.

Research which will increase our understandings of the relationship between home economics curriculum and the ideology of women can point to the conceptual elements required in curriculum which would be liberational for individuals and families. Additional exploration is needed on the uniqueness of home economics education in the individual teacher's experience of teaching about the 'private' sphere of life. Understanding would be enhanced by research focusing on the history of Canadian leaders in home economics education as well as the social-economic and political history which have influenced curriculum changes. A recognition of the origins of home economics in the feminist interests of a century ago when women were struggling for equal educational opportunities and an examination of the original ideals as they have been hampered and altered during the past century can clarify the present issues which require deliberation in moving school programs to a direction and form of value to all students, participating in families both presently and in the future.

Home economics educators share interests with feminists and other female teachers for their curriculum is determined in part by their situations in society and schools. They can benefit by participating in formal and informal consciousness raising or exploratory groups with other women teachers and feminists in other fields, in examining factors particular to these central dynamics in their life.

5.3 COMMENTARY FROM CO-RESEARCHERS

The first draft of this dissertation was written and copies were forwarded to each of my co-researchers. We met again in June, 1983 to reflect upon our involvement during the study. I was primarily concerned as to whether they felt I had fairly portrayed their perspective of curriculum as we had discussed earlier, during the course of the study. Secondarily, I was interested in several other reactions to the study: Were our conversations about curriculum a worthwhile process in themselves? Were my interpretative, sense-making explorations appropriate to our discussions? Is this a useful study approach with possible meaning for other teachers?

Have I fairly portrayed our conversation and your perspective of curriculum?

Marilyn: Yes. Overwhelmingly, yes.

That's why it scared me a little as I read it and it certainly moved me as I read it. Had it not been accurate, none of those emotions would have come.

If it doesn't ring right, you dismiss it, and that wasn't the case. I think it was well done from my educational thoughts and feelings to my feelings as a female and my role that way, to the kind of feelings I have about my home economics role and how I fit into that.

Donna: For the most part, its fair. Sometimes I looked at it and said' Was that the way I felt at that particular time?' For the most part, its very fair reporting.

Were my interpretative/sense-making explorations appropriate to our discussions?

Donna: I found most of it quite close on. I found it helpful

> to be answering those kinds of questions while I was doing the piloting itself.
>
> It was a good format in that you actually have our conversations, rather than just interpreting and putting down views, because I think the person who reads it then can decide for themselves if the interpretation is fair, as well...or if they (rather) make their own interpretation from it.

Marilyn was surprised that feminist theory had become a central part of the study.

> I don't think I was conscious...I didn't necessarily get that (feminism) connected to what we were talking about. I didn't think that would be part...of the dissertation.
>
> Because of that more than anything else, you seem to have captured...the essence of what I was saying and feeling.

The interpretative sections of the dissertation were for Marilyn an occasion to think again on things we had discussed.

> I felt very validated many times.
>
> Other times, I felt, 'interesting conclusion', and it made me think about what you drew as a conclusion about that. A couple of times, I did stand back and give quite a bit of serious thought because I don't think I necessarily thought about it to that extent or felt about it as exclusively as you stated and so I did find myself on a couple of instances - it was my role again, the female/male thing or the excuses I make for myself in order to allow myself not to succeed - those kinds of things. I found that really, really interesting reading.

Marilyn spoke of the critical and yet somewhat gentle look the conversations and writing had encouraged her to take of herself.

> The values I talk about, I'm not doing those. I think I sort of knew that anyway, but it sort of hit me strongly. I thought 'You're not this good dear, you're not any where near what you're capable of being.' And I think I am capable of being damn good but I'm not that good. I'm pretty mediocre right now. That's interesting for me. That's good for me to have that zapped at me. All of us settle into all sorts of complacencies and give all sorts of excuses for this, that and the other thing, but ultimately those don't mean any thing because if Johnny walks away and Johnny didn't get as much out of me,

> whatever my excuses are, it still amounts to Johnny not getting much out of me. As teachers, that's okay to be zapped. I think to be privately zapped is much nicer than to be publicly zapped. To be privately, you can perhaps see and try and do something. Whereas when you are publicly zapped, then you are destroyed. I don't know where I will go with that.
>
> It keeps hammering away at me.
>
> And my own children hitting the school system does that when I see teachers not giving enough of themselves - I think, 'But, Marilyn, you're there too'. When I see my own kids, I say, 'It's not good enough', what I do. It is good to get zapped like that for I think only through zapping, one changes things and alters and tries.

Marilyn spoke of the re-search which was the intent of this study, an open and trusting questionning, rather than a pushing for answers. Answers, solutions which impose and fall short. The re-search, the study was the process in itself - the moment of opening. The re-search was perhaps the means and the end in one. Our conversations could continue, reaching out and returning, to alter and try.

Is this a useful study approach with meaning for you and possibly other teachers?

Donna: I think so. It would actually be a helpful kind of thing to have...that kind of discussion with the people that you are piloting the program with and for, as well. The ideas we have given to you, may have been helpful to the people for whom we were doing the curriculum study, directly.

I was quite interested in the differences and similarities between her (the other teacher's) point of view and mine. Especially when we are both going through the same system.

Marilyn: Most useful to me was not as a teacher but as a female and I wasn't really thinking that that would be part of the work, that struck me as being the most meaningful to me. We all need to be validated many times and it validated some of my feelings and thinking...that this could be a fairly common occurrence, the frustrations and things I go

> through. And therefore taking it a step broader than you and me. I think many females could identify with that whole issue between job demands and home demands and what we expect to achieve in our job and we sometimes don't make those achievements because of ourselves.... That would be useful to more than just you and I.
>
> I think the particular approach and writing style lends itself to people finding it easy to read and wanting to read more.

Finally, we discussed the vulnerable state we had placed ourselves in by reaching for and portraying our beliefs and thoughts. Since each reader will read our words according to their own interests and frame of reference, we risk being misunderstood.

Marilyn: I think I am portrayed accurately and yet I'm not sure I want the whole world to know that because that usually annoys the world.

> When I'm the real me and speaking the real piece, that usually upsets people.

She concluded:

> Being thirty-six, we are political animals now. We are no longer nice little naive teachers.

Donna: I am not worried about it.

> I don't think that what I have contributed is so controversial that it's going to excite anybody's real interest, particularly. I don't think that anybody in our school division is going to go back and read any theses. So, I'm not really worried about it. With any of the people I deal with, if they have some questions about my philosophy, they will discuss it with me....

5.4 THE PROJECT: HOPES AND REALIZATIONS

In this final section, it is time to consider the original hopes which formed this study and their realization during the project. The study represents for me approximately two years of work, two years of a constant frame, a constant awareness of the pro-ject, at times it was set aside and distanced and at other times intense engagement. In this section, I will attempt to collect the personal thoughts of what it has meant to me to be engaged in this study. Spread over two years this now in itself is a difficult task for there have been changes and now the desire to go onward. I will draw on my numerous notes and my journal kept during this time, to express the experience.

The study as an experience has appeared to me as other experiences I have known or imagined. In the early stages, it was as a weaving project. It was a handful of yarns, threads, each intricate and beautiful within itself. And yet, I could see in each the potential possibility for interconnecting and weaving together in an expression complete beyond itself. A feeling, a vague idea, that would come to form as I worked and thought and felt. At the same time was the haunting anxiety of wondering how and if it would connect, if the final expression would be realized. Would it express anything? The project later appeared as a story, an attempt to capture and relate as honestly as possible the lives of my co-researchers as I experienced them and the hope that the reader could enter into the story. In the later stages, I felt my task was more like threading my way through a mine field. One little wrong move, turn, sentence, and the whole thing would blow apart. Essentially the project has been a journey, set out, lived with and soon to be formally ended. It has become practically a life-style, evenings and evenings, surrounded with papers and books at the dining room table. As a constant frame, it has pushed, pulled and demanded. It is now like an old friend who I will be sorry to leave but who will remain within.

The journey began with certain strong hopes and ideals. One central ideal was to build a co-researching relationship with the teachers involved. The ideal of co-researching was to avoid the separation between researcher and researched and to enter a relationship in which the researched could become subject, their involvment being an educational experience in itself, an opportunity to alter awareness. The intent was to portray the teachers' perspective in as rich a manner as I believed it was and deserved to be portrayed. The previous section which includes the teachers' reactions to being involved in this project provides an indication of the extent to which the co-researching ideal was realized.

The person to person interaction of the co-researching relationship led me immediately into the concrete situation of life in schools. The entering a school reminds one of all the somewhat dimmed memories of past experiences in schools. The teacher's perspective is seen as part of her daily life in the school. The smell, the atmosphere, the sounds, dimness of the halls, walking the hallway with a teacher, takes one back. Never anonymous, greeting students, asking about assignments, projects, numerous little stops at lockers, breaking up a hall pushing scene, reprimanding students, withdrawing into an office. The realization came back of what it means to be a teacher, a part of a situation beyond teaching per se.

On another occasion, I had scheduled a meeting with one of the school principals. On entering the school, I was led by a student to a room where the principal was being held, kidnapped for the morning by the students' union as a way of raising 'ransom' for Santa's Anonymous. The situation again sprang to the forefront. The irony of the contrast between our interview and the activities of education. My questions diminished in importance, the lives came forward.

A second realization about the co-researching relationship was the extent to which this personal interaction in the researching relationship touched broadly on all dimensions. Research was not an isolated project, set aside in certain hours. It became part of my life and thus part of my interaction with colleagues in both formal and informal settings. One example of a quite unanticipated event and yet an event which was facilitated and positive was one of the teachers' sharing of the transcript of our first conversation with her principal. The teacher believed it revealed a lot of her essence and that it might help to facilitate understanding between the principal and herself. Similarly, as I interacted with education consultants, taught classes, worked with teachers, all these interactions were a part of my own altering consciousness in home economics curriculum.

The idea of co-researching had its limitations. I was ultimately the one who defined the opening questions although I did expect the focus to be of importance to the teachers as well, because of their involvement in the curriculum pilot project. I also was the one who attempted to make sense of our conversations, it was ultimately my problem, my thesis. We cannot shift our research approaches to a genuine alternative immediately. Both the teachers and I brought our long standing common knowledge about research to the relationship. Thus, from time to time, the teachers did wonder and asked if they were 'giving me what I wanted'. With some reassurance they usually understood the open nature of our interactions, but at the same time it seemed I must know what I wanted. Thus, our present structures which define graduate student, teacher, dissertation, etc., set up expectations and realities which limit the extent to which co-researching may be realized. Despite these limitations, it still appeared worthwhile to inch toward the alternate ideal.

A second central ideal which formed this study was a desire for congruence, which I believe is the essence of praxis. Congruence meant that the experience of the study would harmonize with the ideas, that I would not expect of others what I did not expect of myself, that theory and practice would be one. The co-researching relationship was also part of congruence, the desire for a subject/subject relationship in which the dichotomy of researcher and researched dissolves. Experiencing the project was not an experience of us and them but an experience in which we are all 'us', I am them, they are me. Criticism or critique in this study is not a criticism of them, the 'other', an individual, etc. It is a critique or commentary on the situation of which we are all a part, a condition we all construct.

The desire for congruence demanded an involving relationship with the teachers, with myself and the various projects which connected to this study. The study reached out in multi-directions. The involvement was also the source of pain, frustration, anxiety, despair, and joy.

Early in the study, I confronted my own desires, deep anxieties and longings to know. To know the answers, to know it was possible, to know the project would go somewhere before it even began. Time was spent searching for others' answers. I wanted assurances, comforts, security. I confronted my own fears. I have come to know paralysis. The moments of conversation with the teachers were reassurance. They were moments of pushing ahead, of inspiration, of feeling of possibility, movement, growth.

The project required treading new territory, challenging my own thoughts and old securities. It was an embarrassingly long way into this project when I was finally able to shake loose an old idea: Learning is behavioural change. Of course, I would have readily disagreed on the surface, saying 'oh, no, no, think of this or of that', and yet to really break loose from the old connections of that idea with every other idea and attitude is a long, slow and painful process. All our ideas and feelings are bound intricately to our identity and to loosen one or some is a fracturing, fearful process.

> A fear of knowing is very deeply a fear of doing, because of responsibility inherent in new knowledge.
> (Ferguson, 1980, p. 146)

> Fear of freedom, of which its possessor is not necessarily aware makes him (sic) see ghosts.
> (Freire, 1970, p. 20)

Old ideas were loosened, discarded or reformed through moments of pure joy in discussion with fellow graduate students. Moments in which insight edged in. Freedom emerged. The project in fact pushed and pulled in many ways so that much time will yet be required. The project continues to reform.

> Eventually we know deeply that the other side of every fear is freedom. Finally we must take charge of the journey; urging ourselves past our own reluctance and misgivings and confusion to new freedom.
> (Ferguson, 1980, p. 294)

Part of the loosening, the freeing was finding and trusting myself. Feminism, as an affirmation of women was of appeal and assistance in this process. The project took an unanticipated turn, leading me into feminist theory and history. I smugly believed I had solved my own personal liberation several years prior and had neatly set aside my earlier interest. However, both the project and experiences with fellow graduate students led me back into the considerations. Dialogue with my co-researchers and recollections of my own experiences revealed gender as the unavoidable central dynamic of our lives. How else could I understand? Thus, much of the past year led me over the terrain of family and women's history, the history of home economics and feminist theory in its many variations. Now, I will linger.

In the later stages, I found within writings on feminist research, expression which had earlier been intuitive. Liz Stanley and Sue Wise (1983) claim two fundamental beliefs are essential to feminism. Personal experience cannot be invalidated or rejected, if something is felt, then it is absolutely real for the person experiencing and feeling it. Thus in research, there is a central validity in people's experience. As researchers or readers of accounts, this does not mean we have to share these other experiences nor see them as preferential, just different. Secondly, feminist theory claims the distinction between objective and subjective as false. It is argued that objectivity is the term that men have given to their own subjectivity. "Masculine ideologies are the creation of masculine subjectivity, they are neither objective, nor value-free, nor inclusively 'human'" (Adrienne Rich, 1979, P. 207). Thus it is argued that in feminist research, the consciousness of the researcher is the central focus and must become explicitly present within research reports.

> We insist that the choice is of either including the researcher's self as the centre of research or of simply not talking or writing about it. It is impossible to 'do' research and at the same time 'not do it'; and 'not doing it' is the only way that the researcher's self can be excluded from the centre of the research process.
>
> (Stanley & Wise, 1983, p. 49)

The living in the words of my co-researchers, the sense-making of the study, and the writing of this dissertation had me realize the vulnerability we co-researchers accepted as part of this approach. And yet, the vulnerability is the central feature which makes it an alternative to traditional 'objective' research approaches with their separation of and power relationship between researched and researcher. Liz Stanley and Sue Wise speak of vulnerability as essential to feminist research.

> Its 'different way' is to lay open, to make vulnerable, the researcher. It involves displaying her actions, reasoning, deductions and evidence to other people. We're not arguing that 'vulnerability' is the magic key that enables us to enter other people's experiences and emotions. 'Fictitious sympathy' must be rejected in favour of us honestly saying

> that we don't, can't, possibly know how it is, for example to live as a paraplegic person. But we do construct a view of what this is from how we feel about what this experience might be like for the other person. It is this construction which is made accessible to us through our vulnerability. And it also makes quite apparent the part played by the researcher in constructing what goes on. This is much more honest, because it portrays as central what is central anyway. Social events and behaviours can only be interpreted and constructed by the person who is describing their experiences of them. In essence, of course, this is what research is - it relates research experiences to an audience as these are interpreted by the researcher. Nothing else is possible....
>
> (Stanley & Wise, 1983, p. 170)

The experience of this project, was also in part, learning to trust my own intuitions, to trust my own thoughts and feelings and to respect the connections between each.

> Thought finds a form, when thought is felt. Our thoughts can create poems and ideas.... Thought can make things happen, can create events and circumstances. Thought can alter reality; thought can create reality. The difference lies in the view of mind as both intellect and feeling. Thought is empowered by intensity. Passion is power and the necessary active ingredient.
>
> (Starrett, 1982, p. 190)

> What we need today, most earnestly, is a way of imagining intelligence that is not objectifying, manipulative, alienating; a way of feeling within oneself the coursing of one's blood, the aliveness of one's nerves, the power of one's passions, the labyrinthe intricacies of one's perceptions - and still of acting intelligently. We need models of passionate intelligence, intelligent passion.
>
> (Novak, 1978, p. 85)

The involving, the pain, the passion, despair, re-vitalization and joy were parts of the life of the study.

I am increasingly drawn to the possibility of living a whole life, congruent, integrated: thought/feeling, female/male, personal/political. Finally, this project and this thesis represents an attempt to sharpen up, to tune up, to discipline a muddled mind. But, one that also delights in its muddle-mindedness for the moments of surprise, intensity and inspiration which are the human moments.

Susan Griffin speaks to the present.

> I begin to live with questions. With uncertainty. With an unknowingness. At times frightened, at other times this state of suspension makes me fall in love with the world. I find myself laughing. I am surprised, delighted. The universe holds a secret larger than me. I listen.
>
> (Griffin, 1982, p. 658)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, C. (Ed.). Uttering, muttering, collecting, using and reporting talk for social and educational research. London: Grant McIntyre, 1981.

Alberta Education. Home economics curriculum for junior high school. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1961.

Alberta Education. Curriculum guide for secondary school home economics. Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1972.

American Home Economics Association. Concepts and gereralizations: Their place in high school home economics curriculum development. Washington, D. C., 1967.

Anyon, J. Schools as agencies of social legitimation, Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1981, 3(2), 86-103.

Aoki, T. Toward curriculum in a new key. Occasional paper, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1979.

Aoki, T. Toward a reconceptualization of curriculum implementation, Paper presented at Summer Institute for Teacher Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, July, 1980.

Apple, M. The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict, Interchange, 1971, 2(4), 27-40.

Apple, M. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Apple, M. Analyzing determinations: Understanding and evaluating the production of social outcomes in schools, Curriculum Inquiry, 1980, 10(1), 55-75. (a)

Apple, M. Ideology and control in the personal service professions: Analyzing the school and the home. In Looking critically at professional practice: A dialogue. Marjorie Brown Symposium Proceedings, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1980. (b)

Apple, M. On analyzing hegemony. In H. Giroux, A. Penna, & W. Pinar (Eds.), Curriculum and instruction. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1981. (a)

Apple, M. Social structure, ideology and curriculum. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (Eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981. (b)

Apple, M. *Work, gender and teaching*. Occasional paper, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1982.

Barone, T. *Inquiry into classroom experiences: a qualitative, holistic approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1978.

Becher, T. & Maclure, S. *The politics of curriculum change*. London: Hutchinson, 1978.

Bevier, I. *Home economics in education*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1924.

Blum, A. *Theorizing*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1974.

Bobbitt, F. *The curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918.

Boston Women's Teachers' Group. The other end of the corridor: The effect of teaching on teachers, *Radical Teacher*, 23, 1983, 2-23.

Brown, C. and Haley, A. *The teaching of home economics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1928.

Brown, M. *What is home economics education?*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1980.

Brown, M. "Our intellectual ecology: Recitation of definition, a case in point, *Journal of Home Economics*, 1981, *73*, 14-18.

Brown, M. *A conceptual scheme and decision-rules for the selection and organization of home economics curriculum content*. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1977.

Brown, M. and Paolucci, B. *Home economics: A definition*. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, 1979.

Burstyn, J. *Victorian education and the ideal of womanhood*. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. *Beyond surface curriculum*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1976.

Caplan, P. *Between women, lowering the barriers*. Toronto: Personal Library, 1981.

Capra, F. *The turning point, science, society, and the rising culture*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Clegg, S. Power, organization theory, Marx and critique. In S. Clegg & D. Dumperley (Eds.), *Critical issues in organizations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Collins, S. The personal is political. In C. Spretnak (Ed.), The politics of women's spirituality. New York: Anchor, 1982.

Connelly, F. & Elbaz, F. Conceptual bases for curriculum thought: A teacher's perspective. In A. Foshay (Ed.), Considered action for curriculum improvement. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

Connerton, P. Critical sociology. New York: Penguin, 1976.

Cottle, T. The voices of school, educational issues through personal accounts. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Cottle, T. Private lives and public accounts. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1977.

Craig, H. The history of home economics. New York: Practical Home Economics, 1945.

Cunningham, B. Teaching as being: The right to personhood. Occasional paper, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1979.

Dale, R., Esland, G., Furgusson, R., & MacDonald, M. (Eds.). Education and the state, volume 2: Politics, patriarchy, and practice. Barcombe, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

Dallmayr, F. & McCarthy, T. (Eds.). Understanding and social inquiry. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

de Beauvoir, S. The second sex. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

de Cuir, G. Passages in teaching, English Journal, 1981, 70(8), 32-35.

Degler, C. At odds, Women and the family in America from the revolution to the present. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Denton, D. That mode of being called teaching. In D. Denton (Ed.), Existentialism and phenomenology. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.

Donmoyer, R. "The evaluator as artist - a discussion of premises and problems with examples from two aesthetically based evaluations", Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1981, 3(1) 12-26.

Donzelot, J. The policing of families. New York: Pantheon, 1979.

Douglas, A. The feminization of American culture. New York: Avon Books, 1978.

Dowling, C. *The cinderella complex. Women's hidden fear of independence*. New York: Pocket Books, 1981.

Dyhouse, C. Good wives and little mothers: Social anxieties and the schoolgirl's curriculum, 1890-1920, *Oxford Review of Education*, 1977, *3(1)*, 21-35.

Dyhouse, C. *Girls growing up in late Victorian and Edwardian England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981

East, M. *Home economics past, present and future*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Eisner, E. *The educational imagination*. New York: MacMillan, 1979.

Eisner, E. On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research, *Educational Researcher*, 1981, *10(4)*, 5-9.

Eisner, E. & Vallance, E. *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

Elbaz, F. *The teacher's practical knowledge: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 1980.

Elbaz, F. The teacher's practical knowledge: Report of a case study, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1981, *11(1)*, 43-71.

Elshtain, J. *Public man, private woman, women in social and political thought*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Ewen, S. *Captains of consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Favaro, B. *Re-searching the meaning of consulting in continuing teacher education through phenomenological and critical inquiry orientations*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, 1982.

Ferguson, M. *The Aquarian conspiracy, personal and social transformation in the 1980's*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, 1980.

Finn, G. "Women and the ideology of science", *Our Generation*, 1982, *15(1)*, 40-50.

Finn, G. and Miles, A. (Eds.) *Feminism in Canada: From pressure to politics*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982.

Forisha, B. & Goldman, B. *Outsiders on the inside, Women and organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Frederick, C. *Selling Mrs. Consumer*. New York: The Business Course, 1929.

Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury, 1970.

Friday, N. *My mother, my self*. New York: Dell, 1977.

Gadamer, H. The problem of historical consciousness. In P. Rabinow & T. Sullivan (Eds.). *Interpretative social science: A reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Gagnon, M. My body in writing. In G. Finn & A. Miles (Eds.). *Feminism in Canada: From pressure to politics*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982.

Giroux, H. Dialectics and the development of curriculum theory, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1980,*2(1)*, 27-36.

Giroux, H. Toward a new sociology of curriculum. In H. Giroux, A. Penna & W. Pinar (Eds.). *Curriculum and instruction*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1981.

Giroux, H., Penna, A., & Pinar, W.(Eds.). *Curriculum and instruction*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1981.

Glasser, W. *Reality therapy: A new approach to psychiatry*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Goldman, L. *Human sciences and philosophy*. London: Cape, 1969.

Goodlad, J. and Richter, M. *The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction*. Cooperative Research Project No. 45 of the U. S. Office of Education, Los Angeles: University of California, 1966.

Gorden, R. *Interviewing: Strategy, techniques, and tactics*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1975.

Gouldner, A. *The coming crisis of western sociology*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Grace, G. *Teachers, ideology and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Griffin, S. The way of all ideology, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1982, *7(3)*, 641-660.

Grumet, M. Curriculum as theater: Merely players, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1978, *8(1)*, 37-64. (a)

Grumet, M. Songs and situation: The figure/ground relation in a case study of currere. In G. Willis (Ed.),*Qualitative Evaluation*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1978. (b)

Guba, E. & Clark, C. The configurational perspective: A new view of educational knowledge production and utilization, Educational Researcher, 1975,

Habermas, J. Knowledge and human interests. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Habermas, J. Communication and the evolution of society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.

Havelock, R. Planning for innovation through the dissemination and utilization of knowledge. Ann Arbor: Centre for Research and Utilization of Knowledge, 1971.

Hayden, D. The grand domestic revolution: A history of feminist designs for American homes, neighborhoods and cities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1981.

Hegel, G. Master and slave. In P. Connerton (Ed.), Critical Sociology. New York: Penguin, 1976.

Henrie, H., Strom, S., & Wilkosz, J. Some essential learner outcomes: A problem-solving model for dialogue in secondary home economics. St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Education and the University of Minnesota, 1979.

Hirsch, E. Validity in interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

House, E. The politics of educational innovation. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

House, E. Technology versus craft: A ten year perspective on innovation, Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, 11(1),

Hoy, D. The critical circle. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1978.

Huebner, D. Poetry and power: The politics of curricular development. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing, the reconceptualists. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Hummel, R. The bureaucratic experience. New York: St Martin's Press, 1977.

Hunt, A. Hopes for great happenings. London: Eyre Methuen, 1976.

Hymowitz, C. & Weissman, M. A history of women in America. New York: Bantam, 1978.

Ihde, D. (Ed.). The conflict of interpretations, Paul Ricoeur. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Joint committee on curriculum aspects of education for home and family living. Family living and our schools. New York: Appleton-Century, 1941.

Kliebard, H. Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing, the reconceptualists. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Kliebard, H. Curriculum theory as metaphor, Theory and Practice, 1982, 21(1), 11-17.

Kolakowski, L. Husserl and the search for certitude. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Kosik, K. Dialectics of the concrete. Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel, 1976.

Kuhn, T. The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Larson, M. The rise of professionalism. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1977.

Lasch, C. Haven in a heartless world. New York: Basic, 1979.

Lawn, M. & Barton, L. (Eds.). Rethinking curriculum Studies. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Lerner, G. The majority finds its past. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Littleford, M. Self-reflection, social action and curriculum theory: Part two, Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1981, 3(1), 211-221.

Luckman, T. Phenomenology and sociology. New York: Penguin, 1978.

Luxton, M. More than a labour of love. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1980.

MacDonald, B. & Walker, R. Changing the curriculum. London: Open Books, 1976.

MacDonald, J. Educational models for instruction: Introduction. In J. MacDonald & R. Leeper (Eds.), Theories of instruction. Washington, D. C.: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.

Macdonald, J. Curriculum and human interests. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Macdonald, J. Curriculum, consciousness and social change, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1981,*3(1)*, 143-153. (a)

Macdonald, J. Theory-Practice and the hermeneutic circle, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1981,*3(2)*, 130-138. (b)

Macdonald, J. How literal is curriculum theory? *Theory into Practice*, 1982, *21(1)*, 55-61.

MacDonald, M. Schooling and the reproduction of class and gender relations. In R. Dale, G. Esland, R. Furgusson & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Education and the state, volume 2: Politics, patriarchy and practice*. Barcombe, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

MacKay, R. How teachers know: A case of epistemological conflict, *Sociology of Education*, 1978, *51*, 177-187.

Macmillan Contemporary Dictionary. New York: Macmillan, 1979.

Mann, L. The Alberta home economics curriculum: An evolution, *Journal of Home Economics Education*, 1981, *20(1)*, 20-30.

Marlatt, D. *What matters: Writing 1968-70*. Toronto: The Coach House Press, 1980.

Mazza, K. Reconceptual inquiry as an alternative mode of curriculum theory and practice: A critical study, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1982, *4(2)*, 5-89.

McCutcheon, G. What in the world is curriculum theory?, *Theory into Practice*, 1982, *21(1)*, 18-22.

Merchant, C. *The death of nature, women, ecology and the scientific revolution*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Miller, J. The sound of silence breaking: Feminist pedagogy and curriculum theory, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1982, *4(1)*, 5-11.

Miller, J. B. *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.

Mirkovic, D. *Dialectic and sociological thought*. St. Catharines, Ontario: Diliton Publications, 1980.

Mitrano, B. Feminism and curriculum theory: Implications for teacher education, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1981, *3(2)*, 5-85.

Molnar, A. & Zahorik, J. *Curriculum theorizing*. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.

Natanson, M. *Edmund Husserl*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Novak, M. *Ascent of the mountain, flight of the dove, and invitation to religious studies*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

Oakley, A. Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

O'Brien, M. Feminist theory and dialectical logic, *Signs*, 1981, *7(1)*, 144-157.

Okin, S. *Women in western political thought*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.

O'Neill, J. *Making sense together*. Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1974.

O'Neill, J. *Sociology as a skin trade*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Palmer, R. *Hermeneutics*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

Paolucci, B. Evolution of human ecology, *Human Ecology Forum*, Winter, 1980, 17-21.

Phenix, P. Transcendence and the curriculum. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing, the reconceptualists*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. (Ed.) *Curriculum theorizing*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. Life history and educational experience, *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1980, *2(1)*, 159-212. (a)

Pinar, W. The voyage out, *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1980, *2(1)*, 71-92. (b)

Pinar, W. Curriculum as gender text: Notes on reproduction resistance and male-male relations, *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1983, *5(1)*, 26-52.

Pinar, W. & Grumet, M. *Toward a poor curriculum: Introduction to the theory and practice of currere*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976.

Pinar, W. & Grumet, M. Theory and practice and the reconceptualization of curriculum studies. In L. Barton & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Rethinking curriculum studies*. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Pinar, W. & Grumet, M. "Socratic caesura and the theory-practice relationship", *Theory into Practice*, 1982, *21(1)*, 50-54.

Popkewitz, T. The crisis in the social disciplines and the scientific rationality of schooling, *Teachers College Record*, 1973, *75(1)*, 99-116.

Progoff, I. *At a journal workshop*. New York: Dialogue House, 1975.

Progoff, I. *The practice of process meditation*. New York: Dialogue House, 1980.

Purpel, D. & Belanger, M. *Curriculum and cultural revolution*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1972.

Purves, J. Women and teaching in the nineteenth century. In R. Dale, G. Esland, R. Furgusson, & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Education and the state, volume 2: Politics, patriarchy and practice*. Barcombe, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

Reagan, C. & Stewart, D. (Eds.). *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: An anthology of his work*. Boston: Beacon, 1978.

Ricoeur, P. Ethics and culture, *Philosophy Today*, 1973, *17(2)*, 153-165.

Ricoeur, P. The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as a text. In F. Dallmayr & T. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and social inquiry*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre dame Press, 1977.

Roberts, D. "Adult life cycles and teaching", *English Journal*, 1977, *66(6)*, 38-41.

Roberts, H. (Ed.) *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Rogers, C. *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Rogers, E. *The diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Rogers, E. & Shoemaker, F. *Communication of innovations: a cross-cultural approach*. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Rossi, A. *The feminist papers*. Toronto: Bantam, 1973.

Rotenstreich, N. *Theory and practice*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.

Rowbotham, S. *Woman's consciousness, man's world*. New York: Penguin Books, 1973.

Rowles-Simpson, E. *Home economics in Canada*. Saskatoon: Modern Press, 1964.

Sacks, K. *Sisters and wives*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979.

Scheinfeld, D. & Messerschmidt, D. Teachers' classroom ideals, structural decisions and views of the person-world relationship, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1979, *11(4)*, 299-314.

Schon, D. *Beyond the stable state: Public and private learning in a changing society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Schubert, W. *Curriculum books, the first eighty years*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1980. (a)

Schubert, W. Recalibrating educational research toward a focus on practice, *Educational Researcher*, 1980, *9(1)*, 17-24. (b)

Schwab, J. The practical: A language for curriculum. In D. Purpel & M. Belanger (Eds.), *Curriculum and cultural revolution*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1972.

Schwab, J. *Science, curriculum and liberal education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Sharp, R. & Green, A. *Education and social control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Smith, D. *Toward a critical hermeneutic of the child for curriculum*. Unpublished dissertation proposal, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1980.

Smith, D. "The home economist: A professional?" *AHEA Newsletter*, 1981, *15(1)*, 5-8.

Sockett, H. *Designing the curriculum*. London: Open Books, 1976.

Spender, D. & Sarah, E. (Eds.) *Learning to lose, sexism and education*. London: The Women's Press, 1980.

Spiegelberg, H. *The phenomenological movement*. The Hague: Martinus Nyhoff, 1965.

Spretnak, C. (Ed.) *The politics of women's spirituality*. New York: Anchor, 1982.

Stamp, R. Teaching girls their god given place in life, *Atlantic: A Women's Studies Journal*, Spring, 1977, 18-32.

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. *Breaking out: Feminist consciousness and feminist research*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

Starrett, B. Metaphors of power. In C. Spretnak (Ed.), *The politics of women's spirituality*. New York: Anchor, 1982.

Stenhouse, L. *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann, 1975.

Taba, H. *Curriculum development, theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Taubman, P. Gender and curriculum: Discourse and the politics of sexuality, *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 1982, *4(1)*, 12-87.

Taylor, C. Interpretation and the sciences of man. In F. Dallmayr & T. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and social inquiry*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

Toffler, A. *The third wave*. New York: Bantam, 1980.

Tyler, R. *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Vaines, E. A content analysis of the ten Lake Placid Conferences on home economics, *Canadian Home Economics Journal*, 1981, *31(1)*, 1981. (a)

Vaines, E. The home economist: Action and service for education, *Canadian Home Economics Journal*, 1981, *31(3)*, 126-130. (b)

van Manen, M. Pedagogical theorizing. Paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Annual Conference, Montreal, June, 1980.

van Manen, M. Phenomenological Pedagogy, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1982, *12(3)*, 283-299.

Vazquez, A. *The philosophy of praxis*. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1977.

Werner, W. An interpretative approach to curriculum implementation. In K. Leithwood & A. Hughes (Ed.), *Curriculum Canada III*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Center for Study of Curriculum and Instruction, 1981.

Williams, M. Domestic science in New York City schools, *The Journal of Home Economics*, 1909, *1(1)*, 77-80.

Williamson, M. & Lyle, M. *Homemaking education in the high school*. New York: Appleton-Century Croft, 1954.

Willis, P. Learning to labour. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Wilson, J. A history of home economics education in Manitoba 1826-1966. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1966.

Wolpe, A. The official ideology of education for girls. In R. Dale, G. Esland, R. Furgusson, and M. MacDonald (Eds.), Education and the state, volume 2: Politics, patriarchy and Practice. Barcombe, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

Woods, P. and Hammersley, M. School experience. London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Work, C. The influence of industrial arts and sciences upon rural and city home life, The Journal of Home Economics, 1909, 1, 329-331.

Yonemura, M. Teacher conversations: A potential source of their own professional growth, Curriculum Inquiry, 1982, 12(3), 239-256.

Young, M. Knowledge and control. London: Collier and MacMillan, 1971.

Young, M. and Whitty, G. Society, state and schooling. Surrey: Falmer Press, 1977.

APPENDIX A

Focusing topics of conversations

Marilyn

Conversation 1 October 1, 1981

Experiences with previous curriculum during teaching career.
Beliefs which influence curriculum in home economics.
Ways in which school climate has altered during teaching career.
Effects of the new climate on teaching.
Relationship between changes in school climate and changes in family.
Reasons for involvement in curriculum pilot project.
Expectations of the curriculum change.
First reactions to the idea of modules.

Conversation 2 November 3, 1981

Reaction to idea of modules.
Purposes of piloting curriculum.
Needs of teachers in relation to curriculum.
Experiences within the informal curriculum group.
Reactions to our first interview and this research project.
Purposes of and hopes for this research project.
Reasons for our actions in research and teaching.
Problems for women relating family and career commitments.
Effects of socialization on our female psyche.
Relationship between gender and educational beliefs.

Conversation 3 December 4, 1981

Using a curriculum document in developing a course.
Experience in informal pilot project.
Contrasting the process of the informal and formal pilot projects.
Ordering and priorizing concepts in curriculum.
Relationship between our own conceptualizing and curriculum.
Effects of informal and formal pilot projects on meaning of curriculum.
Personal/professional reasons for involvement in curriculum development work.
Individual needs, career position and meaning of curriculum.
Personal identity and its influences on curriculum.
Role demands, individual differences and interest in curriculum.
Reasons for beginning a career as home economics teacher.
Considerations of other career possibilitis within or outside teaching.
Advantages and disadvantages of teaching for women.

Conversation 4 January 15, 1982

Reaction to experience in formal pilot project.

Reasons for frustration in project.
Contrast in teachers' and administrators' interest in curriculum.
Continuing experience in the informal pilot project.
Plans for experimental course for next year.
Whether the substance of modern living is in process or content.
Frustration for administrators in monitoring or evaluating program in modern living.
Disagreements about content in modern living.
Specific and general things teacher knows about students which shapes curriculum.
Experience personally and with students in the process of journal keeping.
What is distinct about home economics as a subject area.
What would a critical questioning or experiential type program be like in food science or clothing and textiles.

Conversation 5 February 22, 1982

Reaction to final meeting with pilot teachers.
Reaction of department of education officials to recommendations of teachers.
Teacher alienation and self-reinforcement resulting from project.
Impact of project participation on teachers' ideas.
Common needs of teachers in curriculum.
Insight into own self from participation with others in project.
The effects of our conversations in relation to other projects.
The hope for corroboration, deep discussion.
The periphery effects of curriculum change project on interest and activities.
Relationship between our own learning/thinking styles and curriculum.
How do we better programs?
Overcoming inconsistencies between our beliefs and actions.
Admitting our resistances to change ourselves.
Need for overcoming alienation, isolation.
Personal identity - self-concept versus self as experienced by others.

Donna

Conversation 1 September 15, 1981

Career in teaching in relation to previous curriculum.
Useful parts of the curriculum document.
New aspects of the 1972 curriculum revision.
The influence of the significance concepts on the skills areas.
Effects of societal changes on curriculum during past decade.
Student relationships and understandings which are developed through the food studies courses.
Influence of teachers' personal development on curriculum.
Reasons for participating in pilot project.
Differences between old and revised curriculum.
Reaction to idea of modules.
Home economics background of students in classes.
The difficulty for pilot teachers to follow the revised curriculum and control their biases.
Reaction to first meeting with pilot teachers.
The gaps among teachers, university instructors and department of education administrators.

Conversation 2 October 9, 1981

Reaction to discussion at pilot teachers' meeting about the modular structure.
The need for compromise between the department of education curriculum plan and the ideas of the teachers.
The use of the revised curriculum in planning pilot food studies course.
How to decide what should be taught.
Connecting concepts in food studies.
The emphasis on skills in food studies.
Possibility of surmounting boredom in teaching introductory classes.
Influence of revised curriculum on teaching beliefs.
Reaction to proposal for this study.
Impact of pilot project on teaching to date.
Advantages of interacting with other teachers in project.
How can a curriculum document satisfy all individuals.
Plan to individualize the high school program.
The appropriateness of studying the teachers' perspective of curriculum.

Conversation 3 November 24, 1981

Planning lessons using the revised food studies 10 curriculum.
Does working within the twenty-five hour module compromise beliefs or topics.

Extent to which student input determines curriculum.
Responsibility of students for food preparation at home.
The extent to which food preparation is necessary in food studies.

The extent to which students gain in our courses beyond their own learning at home.
Extent to which students affect food patterns in their families.
The usefulness and importance of a curriculum guide.
Reasons for choice of career in home economics education.
Present career ambitions.
Home/family obligations in marriage.
Conflicts between home interests and teaching.
Aspects of teaching which contribute to 'burn-out'.
The possibility for creativity in teaching.
The enjoyable aspects of working with kids.
The gap between theory and practice in university teacher education.
The problems the school has in meeting the social/personal and intellectual development demands of students.
The way in which home economics may meet the daily living needs of students.
Encouraging problem solving related to daily life.

Conversation 4   January 27, 1982

Reaction to curriculum revision and its effects on student experiences.
The trend to modular formatting of curriculum in other subject areas.
Teaching ideas gained from experience in the pilot project.
Effects of revised curriculum on plan to individualize course.
Effect of revision on teaching beliefs and previous course.
Limitations of questionnaires in assessing teachers' reactions to revision.
Lack of communication between teachers who wrote curriculum and those who are piloting.
Concern that suggestions of pilot teachers of pilot teachers will have little effect in final curriculum document.
Differing demands on curriculum according to differing students and situations.
Suspicion that modular format is a means to an end that teachers may not support.
Benefits of being involved in pilot project.
Pressures for teachers to keep up to date despite curriculum documents.
Limitations imposed by language and structure of curriculum.
Expectations students bring to food science, as a contrast to other school courses.

Conversation 5   February 25, 1982

Reactions to final meeting of piloting teachers.
Response to department of education official's final commentary on modules.
General reaction and feelings about participating in pilot project.

Different interests and resources of teachers and bureaucrats in curriculum.
Influences which being involved in the project will have on teaching.
Influences which events and people have had on curriculum during teaching career.

Influence which the image of the ideal home economics teacher and women's liberation have had on actions as teacher.
Influence on curriculum of the need to be competitive as an elective course.
Self-reinforcing results of participating in the piloting project.
Remoteness of administrators and university educators from the classroom.
Disappointment in the low priority which home economics education has as a course in department of education.

VITA

NAME: LINDA BERNICE PETERAT

PLACE OF BIRTH: PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, MANITOBA

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1946

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES:

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1967 B.Sc.H.E.

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1971 B.Ed.

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1978 Ed. Dip.

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1979 M.Ed.

RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE

Classroom teacher
Portage la Prairie School Division
Portage la Prairie, Manitoba
1968 - 1970

Classroom teacher
County of Parkland
Stony Plain, Alberta
1972 - 1977

Teaching assistant
University of Alberta
1978 - 1979, 1980 - 1982

Sessional instructor
University of Alberta
1979 - 1980, 1982

Lecturer, summer session
University of Saskatchewan
1983

PUBLICATIONS

Education, women and home economics, Canadian Home Economics Journal 1983, 33(2), 67-74.

Martel, A. & Peterat, L., Sexism in naming the world: Consciousness in a patriarchal iceberg. Occasional paper, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, 1983.

Peterat, L. & McLean, C. Re-visioning curriculum: The argument for a rationale, Canadian Home Economics Journal, 1982, 32(4), 185-187.

Peterat, L., Herbert, P., & Wagner, B., The materials we use...What do they say?, Journal of Home Economics Education, 1982, 21(1), 30-33.

Herbert, P., Peterat, L., & Wagner, B. Students' views of home economics, Journal of Home Economics Education, 1982, 21(1), 13-21.

Job satisfaction of home economics teachers, Canadian Home Economics Journal, 1980, 30(3), 167-169.